LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

840.9
B83mEd

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

AUG 15 1977

JUL 25 1977

AUG 27 1979

AUG 6 1979

JUN 09 1993

MAY 25 199

AUG 17 1995

AUG 24 1995

L161—O-1096

FERDINAND BRUNETIÈRE
Of the French Academy

MANUAL of the History of French Literature

Translated from the French by
Ralph Derechef

LONDON
T. FISHER UNWIN
Paternoster Square

1898

[*All rights reserved.*]

840.9
B83mEd 103

PRELIMINARY NOTICE

In writing this "Manual of the History of French Literature," which is at the same time, I do not venture to say the promise, but at least the "programme" of a more exhaustive and detailed "History," I have given attention in particular to certain points, which will be noted I hope; but as there is a chance of their being overlooked—if I have been unsuccessful in making them clear—the reader will excuse my insisting upon them in this short preliminary notice.

In the first place, to the customary division into Centuries, and in each century into Branches—poetry set apart from prose; comedy in one section, the novel in a second, "eloquence" in a third—I have substituted the division into Literary Periods. For since the periods of physics or those of chemistry are not dated from the transition from one century to another, nor even from the beginning of the reign of a sovereign, what grounds are there to date in this way those

676021

of the history of a literature? Did writers reflect in the course of the year 1800 that they were about to belong to the nineteenth century; and are we to believe that they were at pains to differ from themselves in view of the advent of January 1, 1801? At the same time, the division into branches is in nowise less artificial or less arbitrary, supposing these branches to become differentiated, after the manner of species in the natural world, solely by the struggle, against one another, to which they are perpetually exposed. What, for instance, is tragi-comedy, if not the hesitation of the drama between the novel and the tragedy? And how shall we perceive this, if we separate the study of the novel from that of tragedy? The truth is, Literary Periods ought to be dated only from what are called literary events[1]—the appearance of the *Lettres provinciales*, or the publication of the *Génie du Christianisme*;—and this is not only in accordance with reality, but is also the only mode there is of giving the history of a literature that continuity of movement and life without which, in my opinion, there is no such thing as history.

In the second place—and with a view to making this continuity still clearer—I have not omitted to note those other influences on which it is the habit to lay weight, the influence of race or the influence of environment; however, as I hold that of all the influences which make themselves felt in the history of a literature, the principal is that of *works on works*, I have made it my special concern to trace this influence and to follow its continuous action. We wish to be different from those who have preceded us in history: this design is the origin and determining cause of changes in taste as of literary revolutions; there is nothing metaphysical about it. The Pleiad of the sixteenth century wished to do "something different" from the school of Clément Marot. Racine in his *Andromaque* wished to do "something different" from Corneille in his *Pertharite;* and Diderot in his *Père de Famille* wished to do "something different" from Molière in his *Tartuffe*. The romanticists of our own time wished to do "something different" from the classicists.[1] It is for this reason that I have not concerned myself with the other influences, except in so far as the succession of periods is not sufficiently explained by the influence of works on works. The useless multiplication of causes is to be avoided, and under the pretext that literature is the expression of society, the history of literature must not be confounded with that of manners: They are quite distinct.

---

[1] I would remark, however, that of the other divisions in use the most natural would yet be the division into reigns or political periods; and in this very book, for example, I have sketched some of the literary characteristics common to all the regencies in French history.

---

[1] There have also been writers who have wished to do "the same thing" as their predecessors. I am well aware of the fact! But in the history of literature and of art, they are precisely the writers who do not count.

Finally—and for the reason that neither originality nor even genius consists in being without ancestors or forerunners, but most often in being successful where many others have failed—I have given more attention to the Periods of Transition than is usually accorded them. Is it necessary to point out in this connection, that in spite of all that can be urged, "periods of transition" exist? And since it is usual to describe them in natural history or physiology, why should they not be described in the history of literature? Not only do not all periods offer the same characteristics, but there are periods whose peculiar feature is to be lacking in characteristics. Able to show few lasting works, they are often prolific in writers of every class and particularly in ideas. Is it a law of the human mind that it often does not perceive at the outset the whole import of its discoveries or of its inventions? In any case, scarcely anything is seen to give definite results in literature or art that has not been frequently attempted, and in vain. Herein, precisely, lies the interest of the periods of transition. They explain the other periods because they pave the way for them, and they are quite unexplained by the other periods; and in this way they transform into a genealogical link the connecting link of history, which would otherwise be chronological or solely logical.

Such are the two or three points I have endeavoured to keep in view in the kind of Discourse, which forms something like a half of this Manual. I now come to the points to which I devote attention in the continuous Notes which constitute its other half; they should serve the former half as illustrations or proofs.

I have made a selection among the writers, and have only retained for notice those of whom it seemed to me it could truly be said that something would be wanting in the "sequence" of French literature, were they not to be mentioned. There are very great writers—not many, but there are two: Saint-Simon and Mme de Sévigné—of whom I have not spoken, because the first *Lettres de Mme de Sévigné* having only seen the light in 1725 or perhaps in 1734,[1] and the *Mémoires de Saint-Simon* in 1824, their influence is not sensible in history. A method is a discipline which must be rigorously observed if it is to render all the services of which it is capable. On the other hand, to other writers, to Honoré d'Urfé for example, I have given more space than is usually accorded them. Finally, there are writers of the stamp of Rollin or d'Aguesseau of whom I have thought it right to " disencumber " history. It is necessary to adopt this course when we begin to fear that the attention may be growing wearied, and especially that in consequence of this passing under review in triumphal succession of so many authors, the notion of the distinctions and distances that separate them may end by being abolished.

---

[1] I note here, as an indication of my method, that in a more exhaustive history, I should place towards 1734 what I should have to say of the *Lettres de Mme de Sévigné;* and I should connect with them that ambition to figure as letter writers, which a great number of clever women are seen to display about the date in question.

Again, this book being a Manual—I would almost say an Aid to the Memory—I have so contrived these Notes, that each of them in its kind, and in its rather narrow but also most clearly defined scope, should be the outline or "summary" of a complete study, and naturally I have proportioned the dimensions of this study, as mathematically as I have been able, to the true importance of the writer who is its subject. I say " mathematically," because in such a matter there should be no intrusion of one's personal tastes; one does not write a History of French Literature for the purpose of giving expression in it to his own opinions, but, very much as he draws up the map of a large country, with a view to giving in it a correct idea of the relief, relations and proportions of the constituent parts.

Further—always in order that the book might be more useful and a more efficacious and constant aid—I have given very special attention to the Bibliography of the subject. *Qui scit ubi scientia sit, ille est proximus habenti:* this old proverb is never more apposite than in connection with literary history. In consequence, at the end of each of these notices will be found an almost complete enumeration of the *works*, and of the best editions, with their dates, of the *works* of each writer; while the notices begin with an enumeration of the principal *sources* of information to which reference can be made if it be desired. It is even incumbent on the student to refer to these sources: first, because he cannot neglect them without exposing himself to making discoveries that are not discoveries at all; and in the next place, because the very judgments formed upon the works of our writers by their contemporaries and by those who have come after them have become, as it were, incorporated with the idea we form of them ourselves. The criticism of Boileau, for instance, and that of Voltaire are inseparable from the notion of the tragedy of Racine. I have also endeavoured to classify these sources, and to arrange them in a manner that in itself constitutes their criticism; but this classification is still all too imperfect — and for this reason I do not insist upon it.

It only remains for me to apologise for the errors that it will be only too easy to point out in this book. I have spared no pains to prevent there being too many of them of a serious or of a too serious nature, for in a certain sense every error of fact or in a date is serious in a Manual, based, one flattered oneself, upon an exact chronology as its firm foundation. But how is it possible to verify thousands of dates and to assure oneself of the exactitude of hundreds of facts without the memory wearying and even the eyesight being at a loss? I shall therefore thankfully accept all rectifications or corrections that may kindly be brought to my notice. A book of this nature only becomes what it is susceptible of becoming by the lapse of time—and owing mainly to the indulgence and collaboration of the public.

1897.

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

It would doubtless be impossible for me to find a better or surer means of inviting the indulgence of English readers for the present Manual, than to offer it them for what it is: an application of the doctrine of Evolution to the history of a great literature. In this way the work is placed, as it were, under the auspices of the great name of Charles Darwin, and while it is not for me to decide whether the illustrious author of the "Origin of Species" ranks, as has been maintained, but little below or perhaps on a level with Sir Isaac Newton in the history of modern European ideas, it is certain that for some forty years past his influence is everywhere to be traced. I shall be happy if English readers see it to be at work in the present volume.

It is not, indeed, that I wholly accept the doctrine in question, and still less the consequences that have been deduced from it in

England itself, in Germany or in France. So far as I am in a position to judge, and I am not a man of science, Evolution is only an hypothesis; the variability of natural species, however probable it may be, is not what is called proven; and admitting selection to be one of its modes of operation or factors, there are assuredly many others. Still, as I myself have more than once remarked, the very serious objections that may be urged, it is said, against the hypothesis in the domain of natural history, lose much of their weight when the doctrine is applied to the history of literature or art, where it is a method as well as a doctrine. Even supposing that species do not vary, it would be an advantage to natural history to study them as if they did; and of all the classifications that have been suggested with a view to bringing home to us, I do not say the spectacle merely, but the movement of nature, the genealogical classification is by far the most convenient, the most probable, and above all the most in conformity with the greatest number of facts.

It is from the genealogical standpoint, then, that I have endeavoured to study in the history of French literature the perpetually changing succession of ideas, authors and works; and if there be any novelty in this Manual it is constituted by this attitude.

I am aware that serious objection is taken to the employment of this method in history. To reply to many of the objections made would doubtless be beyond the scope of this short Preface, but among them is one graver, or apparently graver, than the others, and I must not pass it over entirely. What, it is said, is most interesting, or solely interesting perhaps, in the history of literature or art is the *individual*, Shakespeare or Molière, Milton or Bossuet, Pope or Boileau, Swift or Voltaire, Burke or Mirabeau, Tennyson or Lamartine, George Eliot or Honoré de Balzac; and I wholly share this opinion. Whether we study these writers in their works, or whether in their works it be they themselves that excite our preference, what interests us in them is what distinguishes them from all other writers, or what in them is *irreducible* and *incommensurable*. In their own line they resemble themselves alone, a characteristic that is the cause of their glory or renown. But is not this precisely the characteristic that no method is capable of dealing with? and if we treat the writers who possess it in conformity with the laws of the evolutionary hypothesis, is it not at the expense of the very originality that is their pre-eminent quality? Do we not rob them of their individuality by resolving it into its elements, and make away with their singularity when we decompose it? At first sight it seems that such is the case, but Darwin had answered this objection in advance, while inasmuch as it can scarcely be said that he had the exigencies of the history of literature or art in view when framing his reply, we have the more right to regard it as convincing.

What, according to Darwin, is Natural Selection, and what are the conditions under which it operates? He has told us explicitly, and indeed it is the definition of this power that his disciples, in spite of his express declarations, have so often taken to be a psychological *Entity.* In a given species, among all of whose representatives the observer had hitherto detected none but almost insignificant differences, *it is inevitable* that there should at length appear a specimen *better endowed* than its fellows—a bull, for instance, with exceptional horns, or a horse of exceptional swiftness. Until this better endowed individual has appeared there is no variation, and in consequence no ground or adequate reason for the action of natural selection. Neither "need" as Lamarck believed, nor "environment" as Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire supposed, is sufficient. Something more is indispensable, and this something, for which Darwin expressly states he cannot account, is the apparition of the profitable or useful variety; and it is precisely the fixation or consolidation of this variety that constitutes the principle of Evolution.

Let us now apply this theory to the history of literature or art. A given variety of literature, for instance, the English drama of the sixteenth century, or the French comedy of the seventeenth century, or the English novel of the eighteenth century is in process of development, slowly organising itself under the double influence of the interior and exterior "environment." The movement is slow and the differentiation almost insensible. Suddenly, and without its being possible to give the reason, a Shakespeare, a Molière, or a Richardson appears, and forthwith not only is the variety modified, but new species have come into being: psychological drama, the comedy of character, the novel of manners. The superior adaptability and power of survival of the new species are at once recognised and proved, indeed, in practice. It is in vain that the older species attempt to struggle: their fate is sealed in advance. The successors of Richardson, Molière, and Shakespeare copy these unattainable models until, their fecundity being exhausted—and by their fecundity I mean their aptitude for struggling with kindred and rival species—the imitation is changed into a routine which becomes a source of weakness, impoverishment and death for the species. I shall not easily be persuaded that this manner of considering the history of literature or art is calculated to detract from the originality of great artists or great writers. On the contrary, as is doubtless perceived, it is precisely their individuality that is responsible for the constitution of new species, and in consequence for the evolution of literature and art.

Such, in my eyes, is the chief advantage of the application of the evolutionary doctrine or method to the history of literature or art. Other advantages could be enumerated, but this is the principal: the combination or conciliation of "hero worship," as understood by Emerson or Carlyle, with the doctrine of slowly operating influences and the action of contemporary circumstances.

This is the task I have attempted in the present Manual, in which those who are interested in the history of French literature will find, I trust, useful information, but the true object and primary intention of which has been to try what results are to be obtained in criticism from a method that has renewed all around us in the course of the last forty years. It will be for the reader to decide whether I have been successful. But if I should have failed, it is not the method but I myself, and I only, that is to blame; moreover, in laying down the principle, I shall have given the reader the means of checking and rectifying my work. "Neither Nature nor even God, it has been said, produce all their great works at a stroke: a plan must be made before building is commenced, you must draw before you can paint," and that this is the case is in absolute conformity with the very spirit of the evolutionary method. It is not in a day, nor even in a hundred years, or a thousand years, that one given species transforms or changes itself into another. Darwin was well aware of this truth, which he has repeated often enough! Similarly in history or criticism, time, a great deal of time, is necessary for a method to render all the services that may rightly be expected of it; while one of the worst errors it is possible to commit is to make the method responsible for the shortcomings of the author.

F. B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOOK I

THE MIDDLE AGES

842–1498

Pages 1–39.

I. **The Formation of the French Language**, p. 1;—II. **The Evolution of the Epopee**, p. 4;—III. **The Song Writers**, p. 13;—IV. **The Fabliaux**, p. 17;—V. **Allegorical Literature**, p. 19;—VI. **The Farce de Pathelin**, p. 27;—VII. **François Villon**, p. 29;—VIII. **The Mysteries**, p. 32;—IX. **Philippe de Commynes**, p. 37.

BOOK II

THE CLASSIC AGE

1498–1801

Pages 40–394.

CHAPTER I

THE FORMATION OF THE CLASSIC IDEAL

1498–1610

Pages 40–107.

FIRST PERIOD

From Villon to Ronsard

1498–1550

Pages 40–54.

I. Clément Marot, p. 40;—II. Marguerite de Valois, p. 42;—III. François Rabelais, p. 44;—IV. The Amadis, p. 50;—V. The Lyons School, p. 51.

SECOND PERIOD

The Teachings of Antiquity

1550–1580

Pages 54–80.

The Renaissance of Poetry.—I. The Formation of the Pleiad, p. 54;—II. Joachim du Bellay, p. 56;—III. Pierre de Ronsard, p. 58;—IV. Jean-Antoine de Baïf, p. 62.

Scholars and Translators.—V. Henri Estienne, p. 63;—VI. Jacques Amyot, p. 66;—VII. Jean Bodin, p. 69.

The Origin of the Classic Drama.—VIII. The First Period of the Classic Drama, p. 71;—IX. Robert Garnier, p. 73;—X. The Beginnings of Comedy, p. 75;—XI. The Work of the Pleiad, p. 77.

THIRD PERIOD

From the Publication of Montaigne's "Essays" to the Publication of the "Astrée"

1580–1610

Pages 80–107.

Bernard Palissy, p. 80;—II. François de la Noue, p. 82;—III. Guillaume du Bartas, p. 84;—IV. Michel de Montaigne, p. 86;—V. The Satire Ménippée, p. 92;—VI. Pierre Charron, p. 93;—VII. Guillaume du Vair, p. 96;—VIII. François de Sales, p. 98;—IX Mathurin Regnier, p. 102;—X. Honoré d'Urfé, p. 103.

CHAPTER II

THE NATIONALIZATION OF FRENCH LITERATURE

1610-1722

Pages 107-281.

FOURTH PERIOD

From the Formation of the "Precious" Society to the First Representation of the "Précieuses Ridicules"

1610-1659

Pages 107-168.

I. The Hotel Rambouillet, p. 107;—II. Irregulars and Libertines, p. 113;—III. Alexandre Hardy, p. 116;—IV. François de Malherbe, p. 118;—V. Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac, p. 121;—VI. Claude Favre de Vaugelas, p. 125;—VII. Pierre Corneille, p. 127;—VIII. The Foundation of the French Academy, p. 134;—IX. The Origin of Jansenism, p. 137;—X. René Descartes, p. 139;—XI. Port-Royal and the Arnaulds, p. 143;—XII. The Novel since the "Astrée," p. 145;—XIII. The Heroic Poem, p. 150;—XIV. Comedy from 1640 to 1658, p. 154;—XV. Burlesque, p. 157;—XVI. Blaise Pascal, p. 159.

FIFTH PERIOD

From the First Performance of the "Précieuses Ridicules" to the Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns

1659-1687

Pages 168-219.

I

François duc de la Rochefoucauld

Pages 168-171.

II

Jean-Baptiste Poquelin de Molière

Pages 171-183.

III

Jean de la Fontaine

Pages 183–191.

IV

Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet

Pages 191–202.

V

Jean Racine

Pages 203–210.

VI

Louis Bourdaloue

Pages 210–214.

VII

Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux

Pages 214–219.

SIXTH PERIOD

From the Cabal Organised against "Phèdre" to the issue of the "Lettres Persanes"

1677–1722

Pages 220–280

I. The Beginnings of French Opera, p. 220;—II. Nicolas Malebranche, p. 222;—III. Pierre Bayle, p. 225;—IV. Fontenelle, p. 231;—V. The Reorganisation of the Academy of Sciences, p. 236;—VI. Charles Perrault, p. 238;—VII. Jean de la Bruyère, p. 241;—VIII. Fènelon, p. 247;—IX. The Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns, p. 255;—X. Jean-Baptiste Massillon, p. 259;—XI. French Tragedy from 1680–1715, p. 261;—XII. Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, p. 265;—XIII. Comedy from the time of Molière to that of Destouches, p. 267;—XIV. Alain-René Le Sage, p. 272;—XV. Mme de Lambert's Salon, p. 277.

CHAPTER III

THE DEFORMATION OF THE CLASSIC IDEAL

1720–1801

Pages 281–393.

Seventh Period

From the “Lettres Persanes” to the Publication of the “Encyclopedia”

1722–1750

Pages 281–311

I. Montesquieu, p. 281;—II. Marivaux, p. 287;—III. The Abbé Prévost, p. 292;—IV. Pierre-Claude Nivelle de la Chaussée, p. 295;—V. The First Period of Voltaire's Life, p. 297;—VI. Jean-Baptiste Gresset, p. 305;—VII. Vauvenargues, p. 307;—VIII. Charles Pineau Duclos, p. 309.

Eighth Period

The Encyclopedia and the Encyclopedists

1750–1765

Pages 312–333.

I. The Early Phases of the Undertaking, p. 314;—II. Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, p. 316;—III. Denis Diderot, p. 317;—IV. The First Difficulties Encountered by the Encyclopedia, p. 319;—V. The Second Period of Voltaire's Life, p. 320;—VI. After the Suppression of the Encyclopedia, p. 325;—VII. Claude-Adrien Helvétius, p. 327;—VIII. Frédéric-Melchior Grimm, p. 328;—IX. The Encyclopedic Propaganda, p. 329.

Ninth Period

From the “Encyclopedia” to the “Génie du Christianisme”

1765–1800

Pages 333–393.

I. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, p. 333;—II. Michel-Jean Sedaine, p. 349;—III. The Last Period of Voltaire's Life, p. 351;—IV. The

Economists, p. 361;—V. **Pierre-Augustine Caron de Beaumarchais**, p. 365;—VI. **The End of Tragedy**, p. 368;—VII. **André-Marie de Chénier**, p. 372;—VIII. **Buffon**, p. 377;—IX. **Condorcet**, p. 385;—X. **Bernardin de Saint-Pierre**, p. 388.

BOOK III

MODERN TIMES

1801–1875

Pages 394–531.

First Period

From the Publication of the "Génie du Christianisme" to the First Performance of the "Burgraves"

1802–1843

Pages 394–448.

I. **Chateaubriand**, p. 394;—II. **Mme de Staël**, p. 401;—III. **The Ideologists**, p. 405;—IV. **M. de Bonald**, p. 407;—V. **Joseph de Maistre**, p. 408;—VI. **Paul-Louis Courier**, p. 412;—VII. **Béranger**, p. 414;—VIII. **Lamennais**, p. 419;—IX. **Stendhal**, p. 424;—X. **Lamartine**, p. 428;—XI. **The Sorbonne Triumvirate**, p. 434;—XII. **Augustin Thierry**, p. 437;—XIII. **Romantic Drama**, p. 438;—XIV. **Alfred de Musset**, p. 441;—XV. **Prosper Mérimée**, p. 444;—XVI. **Alexis de Tocqueville**, p. 446.

Second Period

From the Performance of the "Burgraves" to the Publication of the "Légende des Siècles"

1843–1859

Pages 449–489.

I

Honoré de Balzac

Pages 449–460.

II

Michelet

Pages 460–465.

III

Victor Hugo

Pages 465–478.

IV

George Sand

Pages 478–483.

V

Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve

Pages 483–489.

THIRD PERIOD

Naturalism

Pages 489–531.

I. **Alfred de Vigny**, p. 489 ;—II. **Théophile Gautier**, p. 493 ;—III. **Émile Augier**, p. 497 ;—IV. **Octave Feuillet**, p. 501 ;—V. **Leconte de Lisle**, p. 504 ;—VI. **English Influence**, p. 507 ;—VII. **Gustave Flaubert**, p. 509 ;—VIII. **Taine**, p. 513 ;—IX. **Ernest Renan**, p. 517 ;—X. **Charles Baudelaire**, p. 525 ;—XI. **German Influence**, p. 524 ;—XII. **Alexandre Dumas fils**, p. 525.

MANUAL OF THE HISTORY
OF
FRENCH LITERATURE

BOOK I

THE MIDDLE AGES

I

"I have had occasion—a philosophic historian has somewhere said—to study the political institutions of the Middle Ages in France, England, and Germany;

THE AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

I.—The Formation of the French Language.

1. The Sources.—Amédée Thierry, *Histoire des Gaulois*, and *Histoire de la Gaule sous la domination romaine*;—Roger de Belloguet, *Ethnologie gauloise*, Paris, 1861–1868;—Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, vol. i., 2nd edition, Paris, 1887.

G. Körting, *Encyclopædie und Methodologie der romanischen Philologie*, Heilbronn, 1884–1886;—G. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Strasburg, 1888–1896.

Raynouard, *Lexique roman*, Paris, 1838–1844;—Édelestand du Méril: *Essai philosophique sur la formation de la langue fran-*

and as I advanced with this work, *I was filled with astonishment on noting the prodigious similarity that is to be met with in all these laws;* and I admired the fact, that peoples so different and communicating so little with each other should have been able to assure themselves laws so alike." [Tocqueville, *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, book i., chap. iv.] The same admiration or the same astonishment is inspired by an attentive study of the European literature of the Middle Ages. Nothing is so similar to a *Chanson de geste* as another *Chanson de geste*, while as much may be said of the likeness of one Romance of the Round Table to another Romance of the Round Table, of one Tale to another Tale, or finally, of one Mystery Play to another Mystery Play; and two drops of water are not more alike, or, to use a better comparison, two classic tragedies or two naturalistic novels. At a first examination one may fancy he

çaise, Paris, 1852;—F. Diaz: *Grammaire des langues romanes*, translated into French by Gaston Paris and Morel-Fatio, 3rd edition, Paris, 1874–1876; — W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, translated by Rabiet and Doutrepont, Paris, 1890–1895;—the Historical Grammars of Darmesteter, Brunot, Etienne, Schwan, and Behrens;—the Etymological Dictionaries of Diez, Scheler, Körting;—and the Historical Dictionaries of Forcellini for Classical Latin; du Cange for Low Latin; La Curne Sainte-Palaye and F. Godefroy for Old French.

2. THE SUCCESSIVE ELEMENTS OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

A. The Celtic element;—and of the difficulty of determining its nature at the present day;—especially if the Celtic languages and the Latin language are themselves sister languages. [Cf. Thurneysen, *Kelto-Romanisches*; and Zeuss, *Grammatica celtica.*] — That if the influence of the Celtic element is to be traced in French, this would seem to be less the case in the vocabulary than in the syntax;—and perhaps still less in the syntax than in the pronunciation.—Considerations on this subject; and of the influence of the conformation of the organs or of the nature of the water, atmosphere, and locality upon pronunciation. — That though the detects differences, but when it comes to endeavouring to point them out with precision, they disappear, and the uniformity is complete. It would seem, in consequence, that in the Middle Ages, a common mode of thinking and feeling, enforced throughout Europe by the triple authority of religion, the feudal system, and scholasticism, kept under and indeed destroyed in literature all distinctions of origin, race, and individuality.

Quis primus? . . . What is the origin of the *Chansons de geste*; and of our *Romans de la Table-Ronde?* Is their fountain-head Romance or Germanic? or Celtic, perhaps, unless it is to be held, like that of our *Fabliaux*, to be Arab or Hindoo? The truth is, we are wholly in the dark on the subject. This literature is without documents establishing its identity. [Cf. Pio Rajna, *Le Origini dell' Epopea francese*, Florence, 1884.] To say this, moreover, does not suffice, and even when we know that

Celtic influence be ill-defined, still it cannot be explained away;—and in its absence it would be impossible to explain the differentiation of French, Spanish, and Italian.

B. The Latin element.—Literary Latin and vulgar Latin;—conquest and "Romanisation" of Gaul;—futility of "patriotic" arguments in this connection. [Cf. Granier de Cassagnac, *Les Origines de la langue française.*]—The hypothesis of Raynouard as to the formation of a "Romance language" intermediary between Low Latin or vulgar Latin and the New Latin languages;—to what extent it can be upheld;—and, in any case, of the convenience it offers.—Deformation or transformation of vulgar Latin by local accents;—and by the sole effect of time.—Provincial linguistic peculiarities: dialects and patois.

C. The Germanic element;—and in the first place the conditions under which the "barbaric invasions" took place. [Cf. Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions*, etc.]—How and why it was that the "Germanisation" of Gaul could not follow its "Romanisation,"

Gallia captu ferum victorem cepit . . .

Of certain categories of ideas and words that seem to have passed a particular Tale or Mystery saw the light for the first time in France or in Italy, it is in vain that we endeavour to recognise in it the marks of its origin, a local impress, in a word, one of those "racial" characteristics to the psychological or æsthetic determination of which the attempt has too often been made in our time to reduce the whole history of literature. In the same way there is nothing more French about a Gothic cathedral—*opus francigenum*—in Paris than in Cologne, or more German about one in Cologne than about one in Canterbury. And, in truth, the "races" of modern Europe merely represent historical formations, whose literatures are less their expression than one of their multiple "factors." Whether we be Germans or Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards or Englishmen, in literature and art as in history and politics, we have all been nations prior to developing into "races." But before being nations we

from the German tongues into French [Cf. Gaston Paris, *Littérature française au Moyen Age*];—terms relating to warfare,—architectural terms,—maritime terms, etc.—Whether the conclusion can be drawn from these indications, that the Germanic element has left a deep impression on the French language?

3. THE EARLIEST SPECIMENS OF THE LANGUAGE.—The *Gloses de Reichenau*, seventh and eighth centuries;—The *Serments de Strasbourg*, 842;—the *Prose de Sainte Eulalie*, c. 880;—the *Homélie sur Jonas*, first half of the tenth century;—the *Passion* and the *Vie de saint Léger*, second half of the tenth century;—the *Vie de saint Alexis*, c. 1040.

II.—The Evolution of the Epopee.

1. THE SOURCES.[1]—Christoforo Nyrop, *Storia dell' Epopea francese nel medio evo*, translated from the Danish by Egidio Gorra, Florence, 1886; — Pio Rajna, *Le origini dell' Epopea francese*, Florence, 1884;—Léon Gautier, *Les Epopées françaises*, Paris, 2nd

---

[1] As in the notes to this first chapter, we do not follow—and for obvious reasons—the chronological order, but rather a systematic order, we shall follow this order as well in the enumeration of the Sources, and we are less concerned with the date of publication of the works than with the nature of their contents.

all formed but one homogeneous, indivisible, and, if the term be permissible, inarticulate Europe—feudal Europe, the Europe of the Crusades;—and this is why the primary characteristic of the French literature of the Middle Ages is its *uniformity*.

Being *uniform*, it is also *impersonal*. By this is to be understood that at no period has a writer put less of his individuality into his work. It may be said that almost all our *Chansons* might be by the same poet and all our Metrical Tales by the same narrator. Even when we know the authors, the works are none the less always anonymous, after the manner, let us say, of the tragedies of La Harpe—which might be by Marmontel, and *vice versâ*. Is it that prevented from emancipating himself from his social rank by the pressure, the number, and the enduring constraint of the obligations that bind him down to it, "the individual," serf or lord, clerk or layman,

edition, 1878–1894;—Paulin Paris, *Les Chansons de Geste*, in *l'Histoire littéraire de la France*, especially vols. xxii. and xxv.;—Godefroi Kurth, *Histoire poétique des Mérovingiens*, Brussels, 1893;—Gaston Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, Paris, 1865;—Ambroise-Firmin Didot, *Essai de classification des romans de chevalerie*, Paris, 1870.

Léopold Constans, *Le roman de Thèbes*, Paris, 1890;—Joly, *Benoît de Sainte-More et le roman de Troie*, Paris, 1870;—Paul Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature du Moyenâge*, Paris, 1886;—Arturo Graf, *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo*, Turin, 1882.

Paulin Paris, *Les Romans de la Table-Ronde*, Paris, 1868–1877;—Birch-Hirschfeld, *Die Sage vom Gral*, Leipsic, 1877;—Alfred Nutt, *Study on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, London, 1888;—Gaston Paris, *Les Romans de la Table-Ronde*, in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxx.;—J. Bédier, *Les Lais de Marie de France*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 15, 1891.

2. EVOLUTION OF THE EPOPEE.

A. *The Heroic Epopee.*—Various forms of the epopee:—the *Mahabahrata*; the Homeric Epopee; the Virgilian Epopee; the *Niebe-*

monk or baron, does not belong to himself? is the representative of his order or his class before being himself? lacks at once the liberty, the leisure, and the stimulus he would need to venture to distinguish himself from others? The man who desires to be distinct from his fellows can only effect his purpose by isolating himself as a first step; and the man of the Middle Ages does not seem to have thought or even to have felt except as it were corporately, as the member of a group or a mass. It is doubtless to this cause that is to be attributed the poverty of the lyrical vein during the Middle Ages. Herein, too, lies in particular the explanation of that total absence of all artistic preoccupation, which has been disguised under the specious terms "spontaneity" or "naïveté." "The men of this period," it has been said, "are less given to reflection than we are; they do not observe themselves, they live naïvely like children." [Cf. Gaston Paris, *La*

lungen; the Epopee of Dante; the French Epopee; the *Gerusalemme liberata*.—That at its origin the essence of the epopee seems to be:—1, the having an historical foundation, or a foundation believed to be historical;—2, the poetising of a conflict not merely between "nationalities," but between "races";—3, and the personification of the triumph of one of these races over the other in an "eponymous" hero.—That these characteristics once admitted, there can scarcely be question of a Merovingian epopee;—and that a knowledge of what were the "cantilenes" or *vulgaria carmina* that are supposed to have preceded the national epopee becomes almost a matter of indifference.—Further, there is no occasion to examine whether the French epopee is of "Romance" or "Germanic" origin;—and still less, to make the question one of patriotism.—The precise moment of the birth of the French epopee is that of the encounter or shock of the East and West, of Islamism and Christianity, of the Arab and the Frank;—it is personified to begin with in Charles Martel, who was confounded at a later period with his grandson Charlemagne;—and that in this way it can even be said "where" our *Chansons de geste* came into existence: it was on the battle-field of Poitiers.

Poésie du Moyen-âge]. And this remark is justified! At the same time, like children, they only experienced very general or "typical" sentiments, whose expression is as general as are the sentiments themselves; and art is precisely an individual matter. What distinguishes one painter from another is the different light in which each of them sees the same model. The Middle Ages, for their part, scarcely went further at first than noting what was similar or identical in the model. In their view all men resembled each other, much as in our eyes all negroes or Chinamen are alike. And in reality what is it diversifies human countenances, and by diversifying them individualises them, unless it be the reflection on them of an inward complexity, of a richness or of an intensity of life unknown to the men of the Middle Ages? Their literature in consequence is very general, is wanting in individual significance and also in

How from these characteristics of the epopee proper it is possible to divide off its history.—This history must have begun with the songs of the Cycle of the King, with those, that is, of which Charlemagne is the hero [Ex. the *Chanson de Roland*];—to which succeeded the songs of the *Cycle de Garin de Montglane* [Ex. the *Chanson d'Aliscans*], whose heroes continue the struggle between the great Emperor and the Saracen;—next came the songs of the Feudal Cycle [Ex. *Renaud de Montauban*] the heroes of which are the barons in revolt against a royal authority that has ceased to fulfil its office.—It is to be noted that the songs of this last cycle coincided with the waning of the fortunes of Islam.—To the same period should also belong the songs that show us the different nationalities struggling with one another [Ex. the *Chanson de Garin le Loherain*];—and the genealogical poems [Ex. *Les Enfances Guillaume*], whose object is to give the heroes a birth and beginnings, whose marvels shall befit the greatness of their exploits.—A comparison between the poems of this order and the cyclic poems of Greek poetry;—and the Semitic "genealogies."—That the later of our *Chansons de geste* are already, in the true sense of the word, literary epopees;—not less artificial than at another period, a *Henriade* or a *Pétréide*;—

local significance, and this is what is meant when its *impersonal* character is insisted on.

Finally—and in comparison with the rapid succession of artistic ideas and of forms of art in our modern literatures, and especially in contemporary literatures—the *immobility* of the literature of the Middle Ages constitutes its remaining characteristic. For it is not only from one end of Europe to the other that one *Chanson de geste* resembles another *Chanson de geste*, or one Mystery Play another Mystery Play, but it is also from one century to another century, and from the time of good King Robert to that of Saint Louis. Such differences as there are between the *Chanson de Roland*, which is dated from the year 1080, and that of *Raoul de Cambrai*, which is held to have been written towards 1220, being scarcely more than "philological" differences, are only apparent to the erudite. Let us make this point clear. If the

but with the reappearance of the cause, a really genuine inspiration is once that, simultaneously more to be found in the songs that form the Cycle of the Crusades [Ex. the *Chanson du chevalier au Cygne*].

It is almost directly afterwards that history proper begins to differentiate itself from the epopee:—Geoffroi de Villehardouin and the *Conquête de Constantinople*, 1210-1215;—the "epic" circumstances of the event, and the "epic" turn of the narrative;—comparison, in this connection, between the evolution of the French epopee and that of the Greek epopee:—the author of the *Conquête de Constantinople* is to the author of the *Chanson de Roland* what Herodotus is to Homer.—To affect to find "epic" characteristics in the Sire de Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis* (1275) would be more arbitrary—and yet, if St. Louis is its hero, may it not be said that this hagiography is the veritable Christian epopee?—or if the hero is Joinville himself, then the work is already history in the form of autobiography.—The characteristics of the epopee are to be found, struggling as it were with those of history, in Froissart's *Chroniques*. The trouvère Cuvelier's *Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin*;—and the *Geste des Bourguignons*, "which closes the series of poems in single-rhymed date of the *Cid* or of *Horace* were not known, one would have to be blind not to see that *Britannicus* or *Bajazet* are certainly posterior to them. On the other hand, the *Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin* by the trouvère Cuvelier, although it be more insipid than the *Chanson de Renaud de Montauban*, resembles the latter work far more than it differs from it. In both there is the same heroic matter and the mode of treating it is the same. [Cf. Paulin Paris, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxiii.] It is clear that the hours slip by more slowly in those days than in ours—much more slowly, at a lazier pace; life is not so fast, and since it is not on this account intenser or more individual, the result is that if a silent travail is in progress in the depths of this immobility, there is no trace of it at first on the surface.

Still the quickening process is nevertheless going on,

---

stanzas,"—take us from this point to the threshold of the fifteenth century.

B. *The Ancient Epopee*;—and that this name ought not to be given to "romances of adventure" which offer none of the characteristics of the epopee;—the *Roman d'Alexandre le Grand* and the *Roman de Troie* are the *Trois Mousquetaires* or the *Quarante-Cinq* of their time;—which amounts to saying that the Middle Ages were only alive to the "marvellous" or the "surprising" element in the legends of antiquity;—and that in this sense the epopees inspired by antiquity, together with the least historical of our *chansons de geste* serve as stepping stones to the *Romans de la Table Ronde*.

C. *The Romantic Epopee*.—Whether the origin of the romantic epopee is to be sought for in a transformation of manners;—and, in this connection, of the contrast between the Courteous Epopee and the National Epopee.—That the true origin of the romantic epopee is in the differentiation of the elements of the national epopee;—the authentic element of which has become history;—while the marvellous, symbolical and mythical element has become the novel of adventure.—Sources of the Romances of the Round Table.—The *Historia Regum Britanniæ* by Geoffrey of Monmouth, 1135, and his *Vita* and this is the occasion to remark that, as is the case with that *impersonality* or that *uniformity* already referred to, so this *immobility* is and can only be merely relative. There is nothing absolute in history. Indeed, let us add here that the great historical interest of the literature of the Middle Ages is due to the fact that this literature was not hurried or interfered with in its movement by any intervention from without or any individual caprice. It developed slowly, but it developed upon its own soil, there where it sprang up, so to speak, and in conformity with its nature. The philologists teach us that the language of Joinville and of Guillaume de Loris —the language of the *Vie de Saint Louis* and of the first part of the *Roman de la Rose*—less rich assuredly, less coloured, less supple, less subtle, and less refined than our own, was yet, in a certain sense, nearer to its perfection, because it was more logical; and by

Merlini.—The *Geste des Bretons* or *Roman de Brut*, by Wace [translation in verse of Geoffrey of Monmouth], 1155.—Constitution of the Cycle of Arthur.—The *lais* of Marie of France.—Béroul's *Tristan.*—Other "Anglo-Norman" tales.—The connection between the adventures of Tristan and other Gallic heroes and the Cycle of Arthur.—Crestien de Troyes draws upon the matter offered by Brittany;—and it is here that it is possible to trace for the first time in the history of mediæval literature the influence of talent upon the transformation of a literature.

General characteristics of the romantic epopee;—and that they are neither those of the heroic epopee,—nor those of the poetry of Provence:—(1) the marvellous in these epopees is not that of sunny countries, and the same is to be said of their background;—(2) the adoration at once mystic and sensual of which woman is the object in them in no way resembles that which is met with in the songs of the troubadours;—(3) passion in them is distinguished by a tenderness and depth it presents nowhere else;—(4) and as a whole they are enshrouded in a veil of melancholy or even of sadness about which there is assuredly nothing meridional.—Other characteristics distinguish our romantic epopee to an equal extent from Arabian poetry;

this they mean that it was in closer conformity with the organic evolution of languages. And the truth is that no great writer, whether prose writer or poet, had ventured as yet to disturb its development. The evolution of the literature of the Middle Ages is a similar case, and is all the more instructive for the very reason that it was logical. We have now to see how this evolution took place.

II

It has sometimes been asserted that it began with lyrical poetry; and without going back to those songs, of which Salvin relates that they served our forefathers as a consolation in their afflictions—*cantilinis infortunia*

—in spite of its having been alleged that the Arabs were the initiators of "chivalry."—Its inspiration is also different to that of the *Niebelungen*.—At bottom the inspiration of the Romances of the Round Table is Celtic.

How their origin explains their success by their novelty.—The long influence of the *Romans de la Table-Ronde*;—their diffusion abroad; —the compilation of Rusticien of Pisa, 1270;—Italian, German, Netherland, English, Spanish and Portuguese translations, continuations and imitations.—The *Parsifal* of Wolfram of Eschenbach and the *Tristan et Iseult* of Gottfried of Strasburg.—Reciprocal penetration of the Cycle of Arthur and of the Cycle of the Crusades.—Prose versions are made of the most ancient *Romans de la Table-Ronde*;—original works of this class are written in prose, for instance, *Merlin*, the *Grand Saint Graal*, etc.;—in this new shape they become the source of inspiration of the *Amadis*;—and thus, through them, connect the modern "novel" and classical literature with the literature and romance of the Middle Ages.

3. **The Works.**—The complete list of our *Chansons de geste* will be found in the work by M. C. Nyrop cited above; and in M. G. Paris' article in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxx., an analysis

sua solantur,—we are told of "cantilenes" of which our great epopees are alleged to be only the reunion and development. There is, however, nothing lyrical whatever about these cantilenes, and an effort to discern their nature shows them to be, properly speaking, merely diffuse epopee, epopee that *is not* as yet, that is *about to be*, but is already epopee. They aspire to form a composite whole; and with us, as formerly in Greece, it may be said with truth that they have no *raison d'être* except in virtue of and as forming a part of the epopee they are one day to become. The epopee, then, must be our starting-point.

At first, as once more was the case in Greece, it was simply history, supposing it to be beyond doubt that the men of the Middle Ages were as convinced of the reality of the exploits of Roland as of the existence of Philip Augustus or of Saint Louis. Are not children convinced

---

of most of the romances in verse that are allied to the Breton Cycle We refer the reader to these works, and content ourselves here with indicating more particularly:

The *Chanson de Roland*, numerous editions, among which it will be well to point out: Léon Gautier's edition or editions, Tours, 1872–1883; — Th. Müller's editions, 1863 and 1878; — Clédat's edition, Paris, 1886; — the *Chanson d'Aliscans*, Guessard and Montaiglon's edition, Paris, 1870;—the *Chanson de Renaud de Montauban* [*Les Quatre fils Aymon*], Michelant's edition, 1862, Stuttgard; [Cf. an article by Taine in his *Essais de critique et d'histoire*];—the *Chanson de Girart de Roussillon*, P. Meyer's edition or translation, Paris, 1884;—the *Chanson de Raoul de Cambrai*, Paul Meyer's and Longnon's edition, Paris, 1882;—and the *Chanson du Chevalier au Cygne*, Reiffenberg's edition, Brussels, 1846–1848.

The principal reprints of the *ancient epopee* are: the *Roman de Thèbes*, L. Constans' edition, Paris, 1890;—the *Roman de Troie*, by Benoist de Sainte-More, edited by M. A. Joly, Paris, 1870–1871;—the *Roman d'Enéas*, edited by M. J. S. de Grave, Halle, 1891;—and the *Romans d'Alexandre le Grand*, edited by M. Paul Meyer, Paris, 1886.

of the existence of Tom Thumb or of Puss in Boots? But it is history amplified, history "heroified," if one may risk the barbarism; and thanks to this amplification, which is nothing else than an effort on the part of the poet to suit his language to the magnitude of the events he is singing, there is already introduced into history a commencement of exaggeration, and before long a marvellous or fabulous element. Virtues greater than those of humanity are ascribed to the Rolands, the Guillaumes, the Renauds; exploits worthy of their virtues are attributed to them; one of them is armed with his "Durandal," another is mounted on "Bayard"! Moreover as this fabulous element flatters agreeably men's imaginations, it is not long in encroaching upon the historical element, of which it is even seen to serve as an explanation, until finally it occupies the entire field, in the *Romans de la Table-Ronde*, for example, in

Next in order come, among the Romances of the Round Table, and independently of the Works of Crestien de Troyes, of which M. Wendelin Förster has undertaken the publication in full: [Chrestien von Troyes sämtliche Werke, Halle, 1884, 1887, 1890];—the *Lais de Marie de France*, Karl Warnke's edition, Halle, 1885;—*Lancelot du Lac* [analysed by Paulin Paris, *op. cit.*];—*Perceval*, Potvin's edition, Mons, 1866–1871;—*Le Saint Graal*, Hucher's edition, Le Mans, 1874;—*Merlin*, Gaston Paris and Ulrich's edition in the collection of the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1886; —and *Tristan*, collection of what remains of the poems relating to his adventures, Fr. Michel's edition, London and Paris, 1835–1839.

III.—The Song Writers.

1. **The Sources.**—Paulin Paris' article on the Song Writers in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxiii.;—Raynaud, *Bibliographie des chansonniers français des XIII^e^ et XIV^e^ siècles*, Paris, 1884;—V. Jeanroy, *Les Origines de la Poésie lyrique en France au Moyen-âge*, Paris, 1889;—G. Paris, *Les Origines de la Poésie lyrique en France*, Paris, 1892.

which history only serves the trouvère as a pretext for exercising the fertility of his invention; and in this way the *romance* becomes distinct from the *epopee*.

The *epopee* does not cease to exist; and the Songs which constitute the "Cycle of the Crusades" are convincing testimony of the long survival of this literary form. Henceforth, however, it is but a shadow, a reflection of itself, an unsubstantial survival whence little by little the colour and the life disappear. On the other hand, as the purely human greatness of historical events comes to be better understood, the *epopee* is transformed into the *chronicle* as in the *Chanson de Bertrand du Guesclin.* Nothing can be more prosaic, or that there is less reason to put into verse! The authors are quite alive to the fact, and their readers, or rather their audience, still more so. Three or four centuries

2. The Different Forms of Lyric Poetry.

A. The "Chansons de Toile," or *Historical Songs*;—and that they are contemporary with the national epopee as is proved by:—their essentially narrative style;—the part played in them by women; [the advances come from them, and the men treat them with the brutality to which they always have recourse in such cases];—finally by the want of distinction between the epic, lyric and even the dramatic elements.—The epic element predominates in the *Historical Songs* proper;—the dramatic element comes to the front in the Pastourelles and Dancing Songs whose ulterior development results—under the influence of the entertainments of the May Fêtes—in veritable plays, such as the *Jeu de Robin et Marion* by Adam de la Halle, 1260;—but the second element, the lyric or personal, does not make its appearance until the influence is felt of the poetry of Provence.

B. Artificial character of Provençal poetry;—and that it is merely a *jeu d'esprit*;—whose invariable theme is "courteous" love;—but whose artistic value is not lessened on this account: *Materiam superavit opus* [Cf. in Greek literature the poets of the Alexandrine period];—and whose aristocratic destiny is explained by its defects as much as by its qualities.

before the *Art poétique*, they are conscious that the *epopee*

> Is based upon fable and draws its vitality from fiction.

And when reading the *Vie de Saint Louis* by the Sire de Joinville, or the *Conquête de Constantinople* by Geoffroy de Villehardouin, how should they fail to remark that the use of prose in no way detracts from the interest of even an heroic narrative? In any case it is a fact that Master Jehan Froissart, who, the better to honour Prowess, had begun to write his *Chroniques* in verse, re-wrote them in prose;—and thus *history* at once branches off from the *epopee* and becomes distinct from the *romance*.

The meaning and nature of the evolution are here, then, perfectly clear: it is a *differentiation of literary forms* that is in progress. Instead of one form, for the future we have three,—to which, if desired, a

C.—The principal representatives of lyrical poetry in the *langue d'oil* are: Conon or Quesne de Béthune,—Gace Brûlé,—Blondel de Nesle,—Guy, Châtelain de Couci,—Gautier d'Espinaus,—Gontier de Soignies,—Thibaut de Champagne, King of Navarre,—Charles d'Anjou, King of Sicily,—Colin Muset,—and Rutebeuf.—A very few "commoners" practised this branch,—particularly in the "puys" of the north of France;—and among them are cited: Adam de la Halle,—Jean Bodel,—Baude Fastoul, all three belonging to Arras.[1]

D.—Whether either class added anything to their Provençal models,—and that it would seem that they made a more serious matter of love.—But this is perhaps due to the character of the language;—less formed and in consequence apparently more naïve than the *langue d'oc*.—Still they expressed some sentiments that had not been expressed before them;—and in the matter of form some of these Courteous Songs are perhaps the most finished productions offered us by the literature of the Middle Ages.

---

[1] We borrow these two lists of names from M. Gaston Paris' *Histoire de la littérature française au Moyen-âge*, p. 184-187, 2nd edition, 1890, Hachette.

fourth might be added, the *satiric epopee*, of the type of *Baudoin de Sebourg* or of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem*,—all the three clearly characterised; and as we said, it is not any intervention from without that has thus separated them from each other, but, on the contrary, a necessity from within. It will be noticed that a like differentiation of forms came about in the past in Greece, the Odyssey having certainly succeeded the Iliad, and the Histories of Herodotus the Odyssey.

A *differentiation of classes*, whose remote cause would be found in the progress of civilisation in general, appears to be almost contemporary with the last phase of the *differentiation of forms*.

The date of *Richeut*, the oldest of the *fabliaux* that have come down to us, is 1159, but *Richeut* can barely be classed as a *fabliau*; and "the majority of the

E.—Last transformation of lyrical poetry.—Development of varieties having a fixed form [*Ballad*, *Rondeau*, *Virelay*, *Chant Royal*].—Disappearance of the personal sentiment.—Guillaume de Machaut,—Eustache Deschamps,—Christine de Pisan,—Alain Chartier.—"Circumstantial" character of their work;—they essay to make passing events the subject of poetry.—That there is room for astonishment that, being the contemporaries of du Guesclin or of Joan of Arc, they should not have been more successful in this effort [Cf. the best known of Eustache Deschamps' ballads, that on du Guesclin]:

Estoc d'honneur et arbre de vaillance.

They make an effort, too, to "moralise";—and poetry becoming confounded with prose,—it is necessary to wait at least until Charles d'Orléans, even until Villon before lyricism is seen to reappear.

3. THE WORKS.—*Romanzen und Pastourellen*, Karl Bartsch's edition, Leipsic, 1870;—*Œuvres complètes d'Adam de la Halle*, Coussemaker's edition, Paris, 1872. *Chansons de Conon de Béthune*, Wallensköld's edition, Helsingfors, 1891;—*Œuvres de Blondel de Nesle*, Tarbé's edition, Rheims, 1862;—*Chansons du châtelain de*

others seem to belong to the end of the 12th or to the beginning of the 13th century." The *fabliaux* bear witness to the intellectual emancipation of the villain. The same remark may be made of the *Roman de Renart* and of the second part of the *Roman de la Rose*. Whatever be the satirical bearing of these works,—even if it be reduced to the measure of ridicule present of necessity, since we are not angels, in all depictions of manners,—they are "popular" works, of which an entire class of society has made as it were a literature in its own image and procuring it amusement. The social unity to which the *Chansons de geste* bore eloquent testimony is breaking up, and the feudal hierarchy is taking for a time fixed shape. In response to different functions we now have new customs, and of these new customs are born new literary forms. The villain in his turn would have his pleasures; and he

Couci, Fath's edition, Heidelberg, 1883;—*Poésies de Thibaut de Champagne*, editions of Lévesque de la Ravallière, Paris, 1742, and of Tarbé, 1851;—*Trouvères Belges au XII^e^ au XIV^e^ siècles*, Scheler's edition, 1st series, Brussels, 1876, and 2nd series, Louvain, 1879;—*Les plus anciens chansonniers français*, Brakelmann's edition, Paris, 1891, and Marbourg, 1896.

Almost all the poems of Guillaume de Machaut are still unpublished. The complete works of Eustache Deschamps have been issued in nine volumes, Paris, 1878–1894.

IV.—The Fabliaux.

1. The Sources.—Victor Le Clerc's article on the *Fabliaux* in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxii.;—A. de Montaiglon's introduction to the *Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux*, Paris, 1875;—G. Paris, *Les Contes orientaux dans la littérature française du Moyen-âge*, 1875, Paris;—J. Bédier, *Les Fabliaux, Etude d'histoire littéraire du Moyen-âge*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1895.

2. Characteristics of the Fabliaux.—Whether many Fabliaux have failed to come down to us;—and whether, on the contrary,

finds a very keen pleasure, at first in having his portrait drawn, and one still keener a little later, in executing portraits in caricature of other people.

At the same time, in the better though barely educated aristocratic class, the individual, under the double influence of the *Romans de la Table-Ronde* and the example of the Provençal troubadours, is attaining to a commencement of self-consciousness; and lyric poetry comes into existence. Our trouvères,—a Quesne de Béthune, the Sire de Couci, Thibaut de Champagne, Huon d'Oisi, Charles d'Anjou,—all of noble birth, attempt to introduce the expression of their personal sentiments into the conventional forms they borrow from these early masters, forms of which they accept the exigencies with docility, when they do not modify them with a view to making their constraint the closer and the more monotonous. They are but very imperfectly successful. Fresh to and un-

---

it is not to be regretted that more than a hundred have reached us.—Of the origin of the Fabliaux;—and whether it should be sought for in the remote East [Cf. Gaston Paris for the affirmative and J. Bédier for the negative view].—That it may be, indeed, that a few Fabliaux have come to us from India;—but that in general great abuse has been made in our time of "oriental origins";—and that the majority of our Fabliaux, such as *Brunain*, the *Vache au Prêtre*, or the *Vilain Mire* or the *Bourgeoise d'Orléans*, only call for an inventive effort that does not exceed the capacity of the most ordinary experience.—Grossness of the Fabliaux;—and the difficulty of reproducing even their titles;—on account of obscenity.—The satirical side of the Fabliaux;—and in this connection, that they seem to have avoided attacking powerful personages.—How, on the other hand, they treat the priest, the "village curé," not the monk or the bishop;—and how they treat women.—Of the "documentary" value of the Fabliaux;—and whether they teach us anything more than the *Dits* for example;—or a number of other "documents" of every kind.—The favour enjoyed by the Fabliaux throughout Europe;—and supposing their origin not to have been French,—of the slight gratitude we owe skilled in self-observation, when celebrating their "lady" or their "love pains," they would fain note the characteristic trait, give the precise and distinguishing touch, render, in a word, their sentiments in a manner that shall be peculiar to themselves, but they are ignorant how to effect their purpose. They are perhaps too early in the field! Their period is that which has sometimes been called the golden age of mediæval literature, but the time has not come to dissolve the solidarity that binds the individual to his fellows. Neither the mental conditions nor the manners of the period permit this. It is too soon as yet; and in the meanwhile all their Songs, in which there are real qualities—if not artistic qualities at least those of grace, elegance and prettiness—continue without or almost without exception to resemble each other. Still the signal has been given, and this "courteous" poetry, in which the personal

our trouvères for the form of wit the Fabliaux have propagated in the world.

3. The Works.—See Anatole de Montaiglon's and Gaston Raynaud's *Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux*, 6 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1872–1890.

V.—Allegorical Literature.

Of the advantages that accrue from studying from the same point of view all the works of the literature of the Middle Ages distinguished by the same allegorical character,—and these are: A. The *Roman de Renart*;—B. The *Bestiaires*, the *Dits*, and the *Débats* or *Disputes*;—and C. The *Roman de la Rose*.—In this way it is easier to trace the connection between them and the forms that preceded them.—By noting that they all, or almost all, belong to the same time it is perceived that the "allegory" characterises an entire "period" of mediæval literature;—and one is led to seek the reasons for this taste for allegory.—There are found to be social reasons, such as the danger the writer might run in openly "satirising" somebody more powerful than himself;—but there are more especially literary reasons resulting,—from the slight extent to which the "direct" observation of reality was practised in the Middle and when it is clearly established that neither the Papacy nor the Empire is capable of maintaining the unity of Europe in face of the conflicting interests that divide it, it becomes the turn of the *nations,* after the *forms* and the *classes,* to attain to self-consciousness.

This is nowhere better perceived than in the history of literatures. The ground-work of our *Chansons de geste* continues to subsist in France,—and also that of our *Romans de la Table-Ronde*, which are destined to serve for the compilations of the *Bibliothèque bleue*,—but it would seem as if their spirit emigrates on the one hand to Germany, and on the other to Spain. In opposition to the Spanish genius, which is about to combine what is most extravagant in the *Chansons de geste* or the *Romans de la Table-Ronde* with what is most heroic in the "folly of the Cross," the French genius manifests itself as a spirit of mockery, of irony

vehicle, and as it were as the "*passe-partout*" for satire;—pains are taken, too, to imitate the animals' habits more exactly:—and the outcome of all this is something analogous to the "ample comedy" of La Fontaine;—but of a La Fontaine who is no artist—perhaps not a poet.

Finally, in a last period,—on the threshold of the fourteenth century—the new "branches" become purely satirical;—and allegorical;—"the grossness of the worst Fabliaux invades these writings";—or "they serve as a vehicle for bitter and excessive satire" [Cf. Gaston Paris, *La Littérature française au Moyen-âge*].—The matter outgrows the scope of the work;—the general interest gives way to a purely topical interest;—and as this latter phase coincides with the perversion of the language,—the Middle Ages once more miss an opportunity of giving definite shape in a masterpiece to an ingenious idea.

3. The Work.—See for the *Roman de Renart* proper, Ernest Martin's edition, mentioned above. In Méon's edition, 1826, Paris should be mentioned as well: *Le Couronnement Renart—Renard le Nouvel;*—and *Renart le Contrefait*, Wolf's edition, 1861, Vienna.—A piece such as that which Rutebeuf has entitled *Renart le Bestourné*

and already of revolt. Very different from the English genius, as exemplified almost at the outset in Chaucer's Tales, it is no less different from the German genius. Again, is it not almost as distinct from the Italian genius, as the latter is beginning to take shape in the Divine Comedy, for example, or in the sonnets of Petrarch? And thus it is that in Europe, which in the past was so closely united, the *nationalities* are forming by the agglomeration of like to like, by a sort of process of grouping round certain ideas or certain sentiments, to be transformed later on by heredity into racial characteristics.

It is impossible to think without some uneasiness of what would have become of the French genius had it persevered in this direction, or rather,—for it was destined so to persevere, as we shall see,—if this influence of the Gallic bent of mind had not been

---

may serve to prove the popularity of the *Roman*, but, on the other hand, does not form part of it in any way whatever.

With the *Roman de Renart* may be compared, on account of their more or less allegorical characteristics :

B.—The **Bestiaires,** among which are cited those ;—of Philippe de Thaon,—of Guillaume Le Clerc,—and of Richard de Fournival. They are animal tales moralised ;—and whence are sometimes drawn, as by Philippe de Thaon, Christian lessons ;—or, as by Richard de Fournival, amatory lessons ;

C. The **Dits,** and still more the **Débats**—for instance the *Bataille de Carême et de Charnage ;*—the theme of which has been reproduced by Rabelais in his epic account of the struggle between the *Reine des Andouilles* and *Quaresme prenant* ;—or the *Bataille des Sept Arts* by Henri d'Andeli ;

D. The **Arts d'Amour,** among which are cited André le Chapelain's *De arte honeste amandi*, translated into French by Drouart la Vache ;—Jacques d'Amiens' *Clef d'Amours* ;—*le Conseil d'Amours* by Richard de Fournival.—It is due to the influence of these works that courteous poetry finds its way into the *Roman de la Rose.*

and when it is clearly established that neither the Papacy nor the Empire is capable of maintaining the unity of Europe in face of the conflicting interests that divide it, it becomes the turn of the *nations*, after the *forms* and the *classes*, to attain to self-consciousness.

This is nowhere better perceived than in the history of literatures. The ground-work of our *Chansons de geste* continues to subsist in France,—and also that of our *Romans de la Table-Ronde*, which are destined to serve for the compilations of the *Bibliothèque bleue*,—but it would seem as if their spirit emigrates on the one hand to Germany, and on the other to Spain. In opposition to the Spanish genius, which is about to combine what is most extravagant in the *Chansons de geste* or the *Romans de la Table-Ronde* with what is most heroic in the "folly of the Cross," the French genius manifests itself as a spirit of mockery, of irony

---

vehicle, and as it were as the "*passe-partout*" for satire;—pains are taken, too, to imitate the animals' habits more exactly:—and the outcome of all this is something analogous to the "ample comedy" of La Fontaine;—but of a La Fontaine who is no artist—perhaps not a poet.

Finally, in a last period,—on the threshold of the fourteenth century—the new "branches" become purely satirical;—and allegorical;—"the grossness of the worst Fabliaux invades these writings";—or "they serve as a vehicle for bitter and excessive satire" [Cf. Gaston Paris, *La Littérature française au Moyen-âge*].—The matter outgrows the scope of the work;—the general interest gives way to a purely topical interest; — and as this latter phase coincides with the perversion of the language,—the Middle Ages once more miss an opportunity of giving definite shape in a masterpiece to an ingenious idea.

3. THE WORK.—See for the *Roman de Renart* proper, Ernest Martin's edition, mentioned above. In Méon's edition, 1826, Paris should be mentioned as well: *Le Couronnement Renart—Renard le Nouvel*;—and *Renart le Contrefait*, Wolf's edition, 1861, Vienna.—A piece such as that which Rutebeuf has entitled *Renart le Bestourné*

and already of revolt. Very different from the English genius, as exemplified almost at the outset in Chaucer's Tales, it is no less different from the German genius. Again, is it not almost as distinct from the Italian genius, as the latter is beginning to take shape in the Divine Comedy, for example, or in the sonnets of Petrarch? And thus it is that in Europe, which in the past was so closely united, the *nationalities* are forming by the agglomeration of like to like, by a sort of process of grouping round certain ideas or certain sentiments, to be transformed later on by heredity into racial characteristics.

It is impossible to think without some uneasiness of what would have become of the French genius had it persevered in this direction, or rather,—for it was destined so to persevere, as we shall see,—if this influence of the Gallic bent of mind had not been

---

may serve to prove the popularity of the *Roman*, but, on the other hand, does not form part of it in any way whatever.

With the *Roman de Renart* may be compared, on account of their more or less allegorical characteristics :

B.—The **Bestiaires**, among which are cited those ;—of Philippe de Thaon,—of Guillaume Le Clerc,—and of Richard de Fournival. They are animal tales moralised ;—and whence are sometimes drawn, as by Philippe de Thaon, Christian lessons ;—or, as by Richard de Fournival, amatory lessons ;

C. The **Dits**, and still more the **Débats**—for instance the *Bataille de Carême et de Charnage ;*—the theme of which has been reproduced by Rabelais in his epic account of the struggle between the *Reine des Andouilles* and *Quaresme prenant* ;—or the *Bataille des Sept Arts* by Henri d'Andeli ;

D. The **Arts d'Amour**, among which are cited André le Chapelain's *De arte honeste amandi*, translated into French by Drouart la Vache ;—Jacques d'Amiens' *Clef d'Amours* ;—*le Conseil d'Amours* by Richard de Fournival.—It is due to the influence of these works that courteous poetry finds its way into the *Roman de la Rose*.

counterbalanced, almost from the start, by other influences, and foremost amongst them by "scholasticism." Many hard things have been said of scholasticism in general, and doubtless with some justice, though, after all, St. Thomas is not perhaps so much the inferior of Aristotle, nor Duns Scotus of Hegel. However, this is not the question here; and we shall confine ourselves to saying that if, as La Bruyère declares, "the whole art of writing consists in defining well and in depicting well," then scholasticism has certainly taught us the half of it. Owing to the lack of a sufficiently wide knowledge of nature, and still more to the lack of a sufficiently experimental knowledge, there is nothing "scientific," in the true sense of the word, about the scholastic definitions; but they nevertheless served to discipline the French genius by imposing upon it that need of clearness, precision,

E.—The Roman de la Rose.

1. The Sources.—Paulin Paris' article on the *Roman de la Rose*, in the *Histoire littéraire*, vol. xxiii.;—and his article on Jehan de Meung, in the *Histoire littéraire*, vol. xxviii.;—Langlois, *Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose*, Paris, 1891;—Gaston Paris, *La Littérature française au Moyen-âge.*

2. The Contents of the Romance.—The two authors of the *Roman*, Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meung;—and the fact not to be overlooked that there was a difference of age of forty years between them;—or about the distance of time that separates *le Couronnement Renart* or *Renart le Nouvel* from the principal branches of the *Roman de Renart*.—The relation of the "psychological epopee" (Gaston Paris) of Guillaume de Lorris to the "animal epopee" of the *Roman de Renart*.—Guillaume de Lorris, in his *Art d'aimer*, personifies the varieties of love, just as the authors of *Renart* personified the vices of humanity in their animals.—His conception of love;—and its relation to that in the "courteous poetry."—His skill in the handling of allegory;—and that it was probably not the least important cause of the success of the *Roman de la Rose*.—

and propriety which throughout has had a notable influence on the destinies of our prose. It may be, too, that we owe to scholasticism our habit, not of going to the bottom of questions, but of viewing them in every light, and thus of perceiving their unexpected aspects and of finding ingenious solutions to them,—solutions too ingenious perhaps, yet bordering at times on the truth, which, as it is complex, may be garbled by a too simple mode of expression. In any case, we cannot be otherwise than grateful to scholasticism for having taught us to "compose"; for, as is notorious, it is this balance in the composition, this subordination of detail to the main idea, this nice proportion of the parts that will prove to be one of the superlative and characteristic features of French literature. It may be said indeed that the French genius, while manifesting itself as a spirit of satire and oppo-

For all these reasons, the *Roman de la Rose* may be considered as the ideal expression of the sentiments of the society, of which the *Roman de Renart* is the satirical picture.

It would be well to seek to establish which were the works;—in the interval that separates G. de Lorris from Jean de Meung, that "filled the place" of the *Roman de la Rose*;—and why Jean de Meung, who was about to alter its nature, should have chosen to continue it rather than the *Roman de Renart*?

Jean de Meung's *Roman*;—and that the poet himself regarded this part of his work merely as a sally of his youth; — while its significance is on this account only the more characteristic.—While respecting the story and the scope of Guillaume de Lorris' work, Jean de Meung introduced into them a marked disposition towards "social satire" and "natural philosophy";—the first tendency connects him with the authors of the additional "branches" of the *Roman de Renart*;—with whom he has also in common the violence of his language;—and his license of expression.—His inclination towards "natural philosophy" seems more exclusively peculiar to himself;—although it can be compared with the doubtless very unconscious philosophy of the authors of our Fabliaux.

sition took the shape as well of a spirit of logic and clearness.

Further, in opposition to the feudal spirit, which is a spirit of individualism and of liberty, it took the shape of a spirit of equality, not to say in so many words, of justice and "fraternity." *Omnia quæ loquitur populus iste conjuratio est.* Of all the characteristics of the European literature of the Middle Ages there is none that has remained more national, and, if one may venture so to express oneself, more personal to French literature than this leaning towards universality. It might be maintained without exaggeration, that the "Rights of Man" are already set forth in the second part of the *Roman de la Rose*, that by Jean de Meung, and what is more, the contention could be proved. From the first it is, as it were, an understood thing that authors shall not write in French for the sake of writing, but with a view to

Prodigious success of the *Roman de la Rose*;—and that Jean de Meung, with Christien de Troyes, is one of the very few writers of the Middle Ages of whom it may be said that their works were epoch making.—The attacks of Gerson;—and of Christine de Pisan;—evidence of Petrarch;—"Since you desire a foreign work in the vulgar tongue, he wrote to Guy de Gonzague of Mantua, I cannot suggest anything better than this one [the *Roman de la Rose*], unless all France, with Paris leading the way, be mistaken as to its merit."—Numerous copies of the poem;—and immediately after the invention of printing, the numerous editions of the book.

3. THE WORK.—Independently of the edition issued by Marot at the beginning of the sixteenth century there may be cited Méon's edition, Paris, 1813;—and Pierre Marteau's [a pseudonym] edition with translation, Orléans, 1878–1879.

The importance of "allegorical" literature in the Middle Ages is seen from these summary details;—it would remain to compare these "personifications" with the "Entities" and "Quiddities" of scholasticism;—and both with what will be called later "the reduction to the universal,"—or, in other words, general ideas.—That unfortunately, exerting an action, and that the object of this action shall be the propagation of general ideas. Later on, this peculiarity will be found to contribute more than anything else to extend throughout the world the popularity of the French language and literature; and is it not exact that this is the quality in our tongue which pleases foreigners, who spoke of it, as far back as the thirteenth century, as "the most delectable in existence"? The explanation of this characteristic lies: in part in the persistence and continuity of Latin traditions; in part in the efforts of our legists to secure the triumph of the spirit of Roman law over the Germanic or feudal spirit; and finally in the encouragement by our kings of an effort that serves the ends of their noblest ambition, since it makes for the unification of their subjects' aspirations and for the formation of the French nation.

if the intentions were excellent, the method was false;—for the idea did not become clearer in proportion as recourse was had more and more to allegory;—and the writers got further away from nature and truth in the same proportion.—This is what Petrarch meant when, in the letter quoted above, he made the authors of the *Roman de la Rose* the reproach that their "Muse was asleep";—and when he contrasted with their coldness, the passionate ardour breathed by the verses of "those divine singers of love: Virgil, Catullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

VI.—The Farce de Pathelin.

1. THE SOURCES.—Petit de Julleville, *La Comédie et les Mœurs au Moyen-âge*, Paris, 1887;—Littré, *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris;—Lenient, *La Satire en France au Moyen-âge*;—Ernest Renan, *la Farce de Pathelin*, in his *Essais de critique et de morale*.

2. MORALITIES AND FARCES.—That the examination of the *Moralities* confirms directly or indirectly the preceding observations upon "allegorical literature":—directly if the moralities are merely a form of this literature:—by the nature of the personages who are the heroes

III

How was it, then, that this movement was abruptly interrupted? and in point of fact, was it interrupted? For we possess but an indifferent knowledge of the long period that elapsed between the reigns of the earliest Valois and the time when the Renaissance was in full progress.

The language becomes confused, faltering and heavy, grows more complicated without growing more refined, becomes at once more obscure, more pedantic and more insipid. "An ordinance of Saint Louis, it has been said, and an ordinance of Louis XIV. are both in French"; this doubtless amounts to saying that an ordinance of Jean le Bon, or an ordinance of Charles VII. are scarcely in French or are not in French. [A. de Montaiglon, in Crépet's *Recueil des Poètes français*.] The old forms

of them: *Mal-Avisé*, *Bien-Avisé*, *Rébellion*, *Malefin*, etc.;—by the intention of "moralising" evinced by their very names;—and by the covert satire they contain.—The same observations are indirectly confirmed:—by the superiority of the *Farces* to the *Moralities;*—and by the nature of this superiority,—which consists essentially in the fact that the personages in the former works are not allegories,—but real personages.

The *Farce de Maître Pathelin*;—and whether the origin of classical comedy is to be traced to it;—and if its author is to be regarded as a "forerunner of Molière."—Of the abuses in connection with this perpetual search after "origins";—and that a few good comic scenes do not warrant the pronouncing of the name of Molière.—The *Farce de Pathelin* is after all only a Fabliau in dialogue;—the central idea of which is neither very clever nor very deep;—though for all that the farce is excellent.—That the distinction between literary forms must be observed;—and in this connection of an excellent passage of Renan on the lowness of the sentiments that find expression in the *Farce de Maître Pathelin*.

A few remarks upon the *Soties*;—which belong to the period of the are exhausted and the new have not arisen as yet upon their ruins. The epic vein has run dry: there are no more *Chansons de geste* or *Romans*. Fabliaux are no longer composed, and even the important *Mysteries* only make their appearance towards the close of the period. [Cf. V. Le Clerc, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxiv.] The Chronicle, on the other hand, has encroached in every direction. There are chronicles in verse and chronicles in prose. Eustache Deschamps is a chronicler, and so is Georges Chastelain. The most wise Christine de Pisan, and Froissart himself, are also merely chroniclers. They are all of them exclusively preoccupied with the present; and this is comprehensible when one bears in mind the time in which they are living.

Of a surety, it is not the moment to dream of the mystic conquest of the Grail when the English are

---

literature of the Middle Ages that is still almost unexplored.—That it would seem, however, that they bear the same relation to such a *Farce* as *Pathelin*, as the last branches of the *Renard* to the earliest;—or as the inspiration of Jean de Meung to that of G. de Lorris:—once more it is the allegory that itself reacts upon itself,—by endeavouring to avoid dullness by recourse to grossness.

3. THE WORK.—The principal edition of the *Farce de Maître Pathelin* is that of F. Genin, Paris, 1854.

VII.—**François Villon** [Paris, 1431 ....].

1. THE SOURCES.—A. Campaux, *François Villon, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1859;—A. Longnon, *Etude biographique sur François Villon*, Paris, 1877;—Aug. Vitu, *Le Jargon au XV^e^ siècle*, Paris 1884;—Lucien Schöne, *Le Jargon et Jobelin de François Villon*, Paris, 1888;—A. Bijvanck, *Essai critique sur les œuvres de François Villon*, Leyden, 1883;—*Œuvres de François Villon*, edited by M. Aug. Longnon, Paris, 1892.

2. THE POET;—that Boileau was not mistaken in hailing him as unique among or the "first" of our "old romance writers"—The

masters of three-quarters of France; and people have no heart for rhyming amid the tumult of arms. Further there was the Black Plague, the Jacquerie, the madness of King Charles VI., and the sanguinary quarrels between Armagnacs and Burgundians. To sing "the ladies" or the return of spring—

> The year has doffed its mantle
> Of wind, of cold, and of rain,

amid all these horrors and the universal distress, the heedlessness is needful of a Charles d'Orléans. And when finally, during the last years of the reign of Charles VII., or under Louis XI., there is a return of peace and tranquillity, one or two exceptions do not prevent what I may perhaps describe as a Flemish or Burgundian heaviness from invading the whole domain both of literature and art—the tomb of the dukes of Burgundy

Parisian student of the fifteenth century;—his adventures, and how they nearly brought him to the gibbet;—he was perhaps on the eve of being hanged when he wrote his *Ballade des Pendus* and his two *Testaments*;—although on the other hand the "Testament" was a form of composition frequently adopted in the literature of his time.—Whether he was a member of a band of robbers,—and that in any case he was in the prison of Charité-sur-Loire when Louis XI. came to the throne. He was released on this occasion, and from this moment we lose sight of him.—But enough is known to allow it to be affirmed that the great superiority of his work is due to his having "lived" his poetry.

That in point of fact he possesses all the qualities of a great poet and of a lyric poet;—and even those of a wit;—although his wit was generally in very bad taste;—and his jests are those of the stews [Cf. the ballad of the *Belle Heaumière* and that of the *Grosse Margot*].—But he is touching when expressing his repentance [Cf. *le Grand Testament*, 169–224], proof of the sincerity of which is afforded by *la Ballade que Villon fit à la requête de sa mère.* Further he had the gift of seeing and of evoking the vision of "things seen" [Cf. *la Ballade des Contredits de Franc Gontier*], a keen sentiment at Dijon is proof—and from crushing everything beneath its incubus, which the ostentatious display of riches aggravates rather than alleviates. [Cf. Ernest Renan, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xxiv.]

Doubtless there is Villon, François Villon, "born in Paris, near Pontoise," a true gallows-bird, but a true poet as well—one would even venture to say a great poet; and assuredly some of his *Ballades* exemplify the grace and vigour of style, the emotional sincerity, and the originality of sentiment and ideas that attach to this name of poet when it is deserved. What is there grimmer than the *Ballade des pendus*? what fuller of colour than the *Ballade de la grosse Margot*? more naïvely "limned" than the *Ballade que fit Villon à la requête de sa mère*? and—since Villon cannot be named without the reference—what is there more human in its melancholy than the *Ballade des Dames du temps*

of the grim [Cf. *Grand Testament*, 305–329, and 1728–1778];—infinite grace and delicacy when he liked [Cf. *la Ballade des dames du temps jadis*];—the rugged eloquence of the satirist;—to such a degree indeed that in none of our poets is the close relationship between lyricism and satire better perceived;—such artistic mastery that nobody in his own time or since has surpassed or equalled him in the ballad;—and finally his entire work gives utterance to a cry of profound anguish by which we ourselves are moved in our innermost being.

Be it added that to Villon belongs the merit of having at least "summarised" what Boileau believed he had "cleared up."—Villon's ideal is assuredly far removed from that of the "courteous poetry," but if there exists a poetry of adventure and Bohemian life it is his;—and he did not invent it.—Again, the form in which death haunted the imaginations of the Middle Ages has had no more eloquent interpreter [Cf. the *Vers de la Mort* by the Monk Hélinand in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vol. xiii.];—and if the courteous poetry itself, though it went the wrong way to work, tended nevertheless to liberate from all restraint the expression of the poet's personality;—this end, too, was attained by Villon.

jadis? But it was not the example of Villon that was followed. The men who founded a school were the "great rhetoricians": Jean Meschinot, Jean Molinet, Guillaume Cretin,—the Raminagrobis of Rabelais,—Jean Marot, Lemaire de Belges. Already prosaic with Alain Chartier, poetry with these writers becomes pretentiously didactic. Were they alive to the fact themselves; and, "being unable to make their poetry beautiful," was it for this reason that they made it "artificial" by overloading it with infinite complications and regrettable ornament? Their poetry reminds us of the village queen of whom Pascal will somewhere write, the "pretty maid, all mirrors and chains, who admires herself but who provokes laughter." And the result is that nothing of their work has remained, and it cannot even be said that the succeeding age turned its fragments to account. Nevertheless, in their own time they choked, as it were,

3. THE WORKS.—Villon's authentic works consist of his two *Testaments* and of five *Ballades*, the best edition of which is that of M. Longnon referred to above.

He is the author neither of the *Repues franches* nor of the *Franc archer de Bagnolet*, which are persistently given a place in almost all editions of his works;—and of the eleven *Ballades* in *jobelin* or slang which are attributed to him, there are at least four that are certainly not by him;—but all these pieces, since they are attributed to him, are of great interest, as they prove for this very reason the representative character of his work;—and that his contemporaries appreciated it at once.

VIII.—The Mysteries.

1. THE SOURCES.—Onésime Leroy, *Études sur les mystères*, Paris, 1837;—Charles Magnin, *les Origines du théâtre moderne*, Paris, 1846, 1847, 1858, *Journal des Savants*;—Édelestand du Méril, *les Origines latines du théâtre moderne*, Paris, 1849;—Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, Rennes, 1860;—Léon Gautier, *les Origines du théâtre moderne*, in the newspaper *le Monde*, 1873;—and *les Tropes*, Paris, 1887;—Marius Sepet, *le Drame Chrétien au Moyen-âge*, Paris, 1877;—

the reputation of Villon, and more than fifty years will elapse before the *Lunettes des princes* or the *Complainte sur le trépas de Messire Guillaume de Byssipat* will be surpassed in the estimation of poets by the *Petit* and the *Grand Testament.*

In the same lamentable fashion as in the rhapsodies of the "great rhetoricians," the sterility of the period comes into view in connection with the apparent abundance of *Mysteries*, supposing indeed the *Mysteries* to belong to the history of literature, and their text to be of greater value than that of a modern opera libretto. For just as in an opera it is first of all the music and in the next place the scenery, costumes, and ballet that by definition are the essential features of this class of work, while the text in reality is only the peg on which they are hung; so in our great *Mysteries* the principal, capital, and characteristic element is the spectacle or representation,

---

and *les Prophètes du Christ*, 1878;—Petit de Julleville, *les Mystères*, Paris, 1880;—A. d'Ancona, *Origini del teatro in Italia*, Florence, 1872;—W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, Halle, 1893.

2. The Development of the Mysteries.

A. *The origin of the Mysteries*;—and in this connection of the analogy between the origin of French mediæval drama and that of Greek drama;—but while this analogy should be pointed out it must not be exaggerated.—Of the *Tropes* or interpolations in liturgical texts, and what was the object of the Church in allowing them:—it doubtless desired to add to the solemnity of certain services or certain fêtes;—to interest the faithful in a more active manner in the celebration of worship;—to maintain its hold on them, to fix their attention and to instruct them by "amusing them" [Cf. down to our own time the "pomps" and "processions"].—Gradual formation of the liturgical drama:—by the introduction of the vulgar tongue into the recognised texts;—by the material and costumed representation of the "mystery" appropriate to the season; [Cf. the dramas *l'Époux* and the *Prophètes du Christ*];—by the intervention of lay authors.—The *Representation d'Adam*, and the fragment of the *Résurrection*.—Removal of the site of the stage.—Why was it or more exactly the exhibition. Whether clerks or laymen, the authors, or, as it would be more correct to term them, the purveyors of our *Mysteries*, do not even propose to narrate the "drama of the Passion," to teach the masses new truths, or to present them old truths in a new guise; their aim, or rather their office, all that they do and all that is asked of them, is merely to sketch a sort of scenario, which shall serve as a pretext to the burgesses of Tours or of Orleans for mounting on the stage arrayed in resplendent finery,—and thus for procuring themselves the kind of pleasure afforded them to-day by a so-called historical "cavalcade." At the same time, for this very reason, and on account of the living reality of the topical matter they contain of the time of Louis XI. or of Charles VII., it is not to be gainsaid that the *Mysteries* are precious documents for the history of manners.

that the development of the liturgical drama was at a standstill for nearly two centuries?—Impossibility of answering the question;—and whether this impossibility does not throw some doubt on the alleged "continuity" of the evolution of the drama during the Middle Ages.—That in any case the two plays of the thirteenth century that have come down to us [the *Jeu de Saint Nicolas*, by Jean Bodel, and the *Miracle de Théophile*, by Rutebeuf] do not re-establish the continuity;—any more than do the *Miracles de Notre-Dame*;—which have only a remote connection with the *Mysteries*.

B. THE MIRACLE PLAYS.—They consist of an incident taken from ordinary life, and terminating in the intervention of the Virgin or of a saint;—about the climax, and especially about "the plot" of which, there is nothing obligatory;—there is not necessarily anything more or less historic about the personages of these plays;—they can scarcely be said to aim at edifying and still less at instructing;—indeed they are often hostile to the clergy;—and there is no evidence that the Church took them under its protection.—In consequence, their chief point of resemblance with the *Mysteries* is that they promoted a taste for the theatre;—which they may even be said to have developed by means of the *fraternities*, But are not a "royal ordinance" or a "decree of Parliament" also "documents"? and to whom has it equally ever occurred to regard them as "literature"?

The only name in this period, apart from that of Villon, which stands out and survives is that of Philippe de Commynes. It would be a mistake to compare, as has been done, Commynes with his contemporary Machiavelli. The "Decades" or "The Prince" of the great Italian are written in a very different style; their value and significance are very different from that of the *Mémoires* of the shrewd servant of Charles the Bold and Louis XI. Still he, too, has his merits! Commynes has few prejudices,—always an excellent qualification for writing history,—and above all he lived on familiar terms with one of the most original models an artist has ever been offered. This being the case, it is unfortunate that his example, as also happened to Villon,

---

the *puys*, or the *chambers of rhetoric*.—That in contrast to these characteristics, the *Mysteries* for their part are really stage representations of the "mysteries" of religion;—a fact that relieves us of the necessity of dilating upon the signification and etymology of their name.—Herein moreover, and not in any other peculiarity, lies their true character;—which is not altered by the episodic scenes in which they abound;—as is further proved by the only classification that can be given of them.

C. THE DRAMATIC CYCLES.—They are three in number: (1) the *Cycle de l'Ancien Testament*; (2) the *Cycle du Nouveau Testament;* and (3) the *Cycle des Saints*. That in the first of these three cycles none of the Biblical themes are treated for their own sake,—as in the *Esther* or the *Athalie* of Racine for example;—but solely in their connection with the coming of Christ,—whose life entirely takes up the second cycle.—This peculiarity is the explanation and the only explanation:—of the choice of episodes [Job, Tobiah, Daniel, Judith, Esther];—of the grossness of some of them, which is meant to bring into keener relief the figure of Christ;—and finally of the part that was long taken by the clergy in the representation of the *Mysteries*.—Of the *Cycle des Saints* and of its generally local character;—which is bore no fruit, but that on the contrary, far from his having given rise to a literary movement, in him and with him our chroniclers come to an end. His talent is merely an accident, as was that of Villon; and not only is it not from him that our classical historians descend, but he can scarcely be regarded even as the forerunner of those authors of Memoirs, who are soon to become so numerous in the history of our literature.

Thus, whichever way we look, and neglecting one or two exceptions such as there must always be, we discover nothing but symptoms of decadence, and it seems that the literature of the Middle Ages in all its branches, at any rate in France, has met with a check in its growth at the climacteric moment of its development. This amounts to saying that the literature we refer to was marked by all the qualities that are characteristic of childhood; and for this reason we may still turn to it

not the more lay on that account. — The *Mysteries* are "object lessons," a mode of teaching the masses the essential truths of religion; and as has been said, a means of obtaining a hold on the masses.—That there are only two *Mysteries* that constitute an exception:—the *Mystère du Siège d'Orléans* and the *Mystère de Troie*;—but the mood that inspired the former had nothing incompatible with the essential character of the sacred *Mysteries* —and that the latter was doubtless never represented.

D. The Value of the Mysteries,—and that in general, from a literary point of view, they are mediocrity itself;—which is easily understandable granting that the drama is as self-dependent as any other independent art;—further it is only by an accident that their history coincides with that of literature.—But the *Mysteries* are not even drama: they are merely "spectacle,"—and their authors only handled them as such.—That this opinion is borne out by the very conditions under which the *Mysteries* were represented.—And by this is not meant that they do not occasionally contain interesting "incidents," for such incidents are found in some of the *Mysteries* of the *Cycle des Saints*;—scenes in which there are traces of the greatness of the model, as in the *Mysteries* of the *Cycle de l'Ancien* to-day, as to a purer source, and refresh in it our fevered imaginations. But from the qualities of childhood it passed by an abrupt transition to the infirmities of decrepitude, and nothing or scarcely anything occupies the interval. Never perhaps since the remote times of Homer and the Greek epopee had epic matter been more abundant, richer, and fresher than that of the *Chansons de Geste* or the *Romans de la Table-Ronde*. We ourselves are still living on it! Yet during four hundred years, from one poem to another, from the earliest *Chansons de geste* to the latest prose versions of the *Bibliothèque bleue*, this epic matter floated in a diffuse state, without any of our old trouvères, the author of *Roland*, as little as that of *Parsifal*, being successful in giving it a shape that should present it "under its eternal aspect." The "dramatists" did not perceive the fact that the nature

Testament;—and curious "episodes" of a more or less realistic character as in the *Cycle du Nouveau Testament*;—but what is meant is that they have no literary value;—that there is no cause to regret their decadence or their extinction,—and that they furnished no element even to the "Christian" drama of the classic period.

3. The Works.—The *Mystère du Vieux Testament*, edited by James de Rothschild and Émile Picot, Paris, 1878–1891;—the *Mystère de la Passion*, by Arnoul Gréban, edited by MM. Gaston Paris and Gaston Raynaud, Paris, 1878;—*Les Actes des Apôtres*, by Simon and Arnoul Gréban, in 62,000 verses;—the *Mystères de Sainte Barbe*, *Saint Denis*, *Saint Laurent*, *Saint Louis*, &c.;—the *Mystère du Siège d'Orléans*, by MM. Guessard and Certain in the collection of *Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1862.

Further, excellent analyses will be found of all the *Mysteries* that have come down to us, whether in manuscript or printed, in the second volume of M. Petit de Julleville's work on the *Mysteries*.

IX.—**Philippe de Commynes** [Château de Commynes, 1447; † 1511, Château d'Argenton].

1. The Sources.—Lenglet du Fresnoy in his edition of the *Mémoires*,

or essence of drama is *action*; and for want of this intuition, it is seen, from the *procession* it began by being, to become at first an exhibition, after an exhibition a spectacle, and finally after a spectacle a show of the sort that is seen at fairs. And lyric poetry, fettered in its flight by circumstances, had no sooner spread its wings than it was constrained to fold them, and confining its free inspiration in poems of a conventional impersonality, to content itself with the commonplaces of the "courteous" poetry. What has just been said is expressed in a general way, when it is affirmed that the Renaissance, far from having accomplished a work of destruction, did not even interrupt what was already in progress. If the literature of the Middle Ages were not dead when the spirit of the Renaissance began to get abroad in the world, it had been expiring for two hundred years and more. It is therefore possible, it is even probable, that in the absence

1747;—Mlle Dupont's Notice preceding her edition of the *Mémoires*, Paris, 1840;—Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Lettres et négociations de Philippe de Commynes*, Brussels, 1867, 1874;—Chantelauze, Notice preceding his edition of the *Mémoires*, Paris, 1880;—Fierville, *Documents inédits sur Philippe de Commynes*, Paris, 1881.

2. The Man and the Writer.—The favourite of Charles the Bold and the counsellor of Louis XI.—His numerous missions and his political rôle.—His disgrace, 1486.—He reappears at court, 1492.—His retirement, 1498.—His last years, 1505–1510;—and his death.

Originality of Commynes.—He is himself, and this distinguishes him from the chroniclers contemporary with him;—who, whether they write in French or Latin, are scarcely more than the expression of their time;—reflecting public opinion rather than uttering their own thoughts.—His experience of public affairs.—Qualities of his *Mémoires*;—they are those of a politician;—and also of a psychologist [Cf. *Mémoires*, iv. 6, and vii. 9].—It may even be said that in places they are those of a philosopher [Cf. ii. 6, for example, and v. 18].—But they are not the work of an artist [Cf. Froissart];—or of an historian who is at the same time a moralist—capable, that is, of deducing from events a signification of greater import than the facts of the spirit of the Renaissance some other new spirit would have entered and quickened this remnant of an existence. But this did not happen; and in the meantime the Renaissance was about to provide us with three things we had so far lacked: an artistic model, by setting before us the great examples of antiquity; the ambition to reproduce and imitate the ancient forms of art; and to fill up these forms, if I may so express myself, new methods, in the shape of a new manner of observing nature and man.

themselves;—It is this trait among others that distinguishes him from his contemporary Machiavelli;—and not to mention his ignorance of Latin or of classical traditions.—His qualities as a writer;—and the extent to which they are marked by the spirit of the Middle Ages.

3. THE WORK.—Apart from his "negociations," the work of Commynes is restricted to his *Mémoires*. He did not have the time to finish them, and they stop at 1498.

The first edition of them appeared in 1524, under the title of *Chronique de Louis XI.*; and as to the last portion in 1528, under the title of *Chronique de Charles VIII.*

The best modern editions are those of Mlle Dupont, Paris, 1840;—and Chantelauze's edition, Paris, 1881.

BOOK II

CHAPTER I

THE FORMATION OF THE CLASSIC IDEAL

I

It was in Italy that the signal was given, and it was the humanists who gave it. This name of *humanists* is applied to the poets, to the men of culture—and also to the pedants—who revived or rather who rediscovered the

THE AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

First Period

Villon to Ronsard

1490–1550

I.—**Clément Marot** [Cahors, 1495 ; † 1544, Turin].

1. The Sources. — *L'Adolescence* and *la Suite de l'Adolescence Clémentine* [1] ; — Bayle : *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, art. Marot.—Lenglet du Fresnoy in his edition of the Works of Marot, vols. i. and vi. ;—Goujet : *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xi. ;—Ch. d'Héricault, *Œuvres choisies de Marot*, introduction, Paris, 1867 ;

---

[1] We expressly include the works of a writer among *the Sources* of his biography only when they contain, as dose *l'Adolescence Clémentine*, information that is personal and given as such by the author.

lost significance of antiquity. Not that they themselves always appreciated it quite aright, or more particularly, as was too long believed, that the Middle Ages entirely ignored it. The Middle Ages were acquainted with Cicero and Virgil, Livy and Horace, Ovid and Seneca, Plautus and Juvenal; they even translated and imitated them! But "they had only turned them to account, says an historian there is little reason to mistrust,—Canon J. Janssen, in his memorable work on the Reformation in Germany,—as a medium *that might help them to a more profound understanding of Christianity, and to an improvement of the moral life*"; and this was doubtless a perfectly legitimate manner of making use of them, but it was possible to conceive a different manner. The chief innovation effected by *humanism* was to make the object of the study or knowledge of Latin antiquity that study or

—O. Douen: *Clément Marot et le Psautier huguenot*, Paris, 1878;—G. Guiffrey: *Œuvres de Marot*, vols. i. and ii., which are all that have appeared, Paris, n.d.

2. THE MAN AND THE POET.—Did he belong to Quercy or to Normandy?—The disciple of his father, Jean Marot, and of the "great rhetoricians";—his youth and his love affairs;—his edition of the *Rommant de la Rose*, 1527.—The valet de chambre of François I. —Marot's imprisonments.—The publication of *l'Adolescence Clémentine*, 1532; and the edition of the Works of Villon, 1533.—Marot and Protestantism.—His stay at Ferrara.—Return to Paris.—The *Traduction des Psaumes*, 1541.—Marot in Geneva;—his quarrels with Calvin; —he leaves Geneva for Turin, where he dies in 1544.

Esteem in which Marot is held;—and the qualities that justify it: wit, clearness, and sly humour.—That these qualities are scarcely those of a poet, but rather of a prose writer, who should have fitted rhymes to his prose.—Marot possessed neither the intensity of feeling, nor the picturesqueness of vision, nor the vividness of style of a poet; —Marot's ideas commonplace;—and that Marot must not be underestimated;—but that it is necessary to assign him no more than his proper value, if the work of Ronsard and the reform he accomplished are to be rightly appreciated.

knowledge itself, and in this way to transform, solely by displacing them, the very foundations of education and intellectual culture. For there is a wide difference between the disposition of mind which induces the reader to search the *Tusculanae* or the sixth book of the *Æneid* for premonitory signs of the approaching advent of Christianity, and that which leads him merely to seek in these works, with a view to deriving pleasure from them, the evidences of the melancholy genius of Virgil or of the eloquence of Cicero. Numerous points which were overlooked in the first case came into sight in the second, aroused attention and held it. Suppose that at the present day we were to affect to regard Rabelais and Molière merely as the "forerunners of the French Revolution"—and they are its forerunners in a certain measure and a certain sense—and endeavour to count

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Marot are composed: (1) of Translations and Allegories, such as his translation of the *Metamorphoses*, bk. i. and ii., and his *Temple de Cupido*, or again his *Enfer*;—(2) of *Chants royaux*, *Ballads*, and *Rondeaux*;—(3) of *Elegies*, *Epistles*, and *Epigrams*;—(4) of occasional pieces, that figure in anthologies under the titles *Etrennes*, *Epitaphes*, *Blasons*, *Cimetières*, and *Complaintes*;—(5) of his translation of fifty of the Psalms.

The best editions are the Niort edition, 1596, published by Thomas Portau;—Lenglet du Fresnoy's edition, The Hague, 1731, Gosse and Néaulme;—and among the modern editions, that published at Lyons by Scheuring, 1869;—and that of Guiffrey, which unhappily has remained unfinished.

II.—**Marguerite de Valois** [Angoulême, 1492; †1549, Château d'Odos].

1. THE SOURCES.—Brantôme: *Les Dames Illustres*, sixth discourse, article 6;—Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique*, article MARGUERITE;—Génin: *Notice sur Marguerite* preceding his edition of the *Lettres*, Paris, 1841;—Leroux de Lincy: Notice preceding his edition of the *Heptaméron*, Paris, 1853;—La Ferrière: *Le Livre de dépenses de la*

how many of their most characteristic traits would be lost for us. To search *Tartuffe* with a view to learning the religious opinions of Molière is one way of reading the work, but not the only way,—and above all not the most literary way. [Cf. Janssen, *l'Allemagne et la Réforme;* French translation, Paris, 1887, vols. i. and ii.; and Furcy-Raynaud's translation of Pastor's *Histoire des Papes*, Paris, 1888, vol. i.]

On the other hand, while the Middle Ages were fairly well acquainted with Latin literature, they were almost wholly ignorant of Greek literature. *Græcum est, non legitur!* Greek was the language of the chief heresies, the language of Nestorius, Arius, and Eutyches. It is true indeed that in spite of the proverb, St. Thomas d'Acquinas, to mention but him, was deeply versed in Aristotle. But it does not seem that the Middle Ages

reine de Navarre, Paris, 1862;—*Marguerite de Valois*, by the author of *Robert Emmet* [C^tesse^ d'Haussonville], Paris, 1870.

2. THE WOMAN AND THE WRITER.—The mischances of a royal reputation;—and how Marguerite has been the victim of the excess or the indiscreetness of her affection for her brother, François I.;—and of the liking of biographers for scandalous anecdotes;—and of her homonymy with another Marguerite, whose memory has been popularised by *Le Pré aux Clercs*, *Les Huguenots*, and *La Reine Margot*.—But the evidence of her contemporaries,—and the examination of her works themselves, the *Heptameron* included,—give an exactly contrary idea of her.

Composition of the *Heptaméron*;—testimony of Brantôme;—comparison between the *Heptaméron* and Boccaccio's *Decameron* and the *Propos et Joyeux devis* of Bonaventure des Périers. That the grossness of some of the stories in it merely proves the grossness of the manners and language of the time;—but that Marguerite's object was to combat this grossness;—and that the proof of this is to be found in the Dialogues that separate the "days."—The historical allusions in the *Heptaméron*,—that it is the book of a virtuous woman and even of a woman somewhat given to "preaching";—testimony of du Verdier in his *Bibliothèque*, vol. iv., edition of 1772. The study of the *Poésies* were acquainted with Homer, Herodotus, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Pindar, Demosthenes, and the Alexandrians. How could a knowledge have been acquired of these writers since there was not a single professor of Greek at the University of Paris? In consequence, when the Humanists began to steep themselves in Grecian lore, they inaugurated a veritable revolution. The fact is too commonly overlooked when it is attempted, doubtless with a view to lessening our debt to the Renaissance, to contest the originality of that movement. One of the reasons, probably, why the Renaissance did not come to a head sooner, is that the study of Latin was insufficient to provoke it. To accomplish this the dispersion was necessary of the Greek element throughout the Europe of the fifteenth century, as the consequence of the

and the *Lettres* confirms this interpretation;—since Marguerite's *Poésies* are in general pious poetry;—"She was very fond of composing devout verses," says Brantôme, "for she was much inclined to godliness";—and her *Lettres*, when they were not business letters or poetical letters, are "mystic" letters.—Of Marguerite's attitude towards Protestantism.—The incident of the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*.—The last years of Marguerite and her death.

3. THE WORKS.—*Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses*, 1547;—*L'Heptaméron des nouvelles de la Reine de Navarre*, first edition, 1558, and second edition, 1559;—*Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême*, published by Génin, Paris, 1841, for the *Société de l'histoire de France*;—*Dernières poésies de la Reine de Navarre*, edited by Abel Lefranc, Paris, 1896.

The best edition of the *Heptameron* is that of Leroux de Lincy.

III.—**François Rabelais** [Chinon, 1483, or 90 or 95; † 1552 or 53, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Niceron in his *Hommes illustres*, vol. xxxii.;—Chaufepié, in his *Dictionnaire*, article "Rabelais," very exhaustive and very important;—J. Ch. Brunet: *Recherches sur les editions originales de Rabelais*, Paris, 1834, and the new edition, greatly

taking of Constantinople by the Turks. And even if it be impossible to say in what manner, or precisely in what connection, the influence made itself felt, its effects are not on this account less certain, but merely more hidden and far reaching. [Cf. Emile Egger, *l'Hellénisme en France*, Paris, 1869; and Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classichen Alterthums*.]

It is needful, too, to take into account the essential quality of the Italian genius. "Does the human plant," in Alfieri's famous words, "grow more sturdily in Italy than elsewhere?" The question is open to discussion, and it might be found that there is much ingenuousness in the sort of admiring bewilderment our dilettanti experience or affect to experience in presence of a Cæsar Borgia—who, perhaps, as the son of his father, was as much a Spaniard as an Italian. What, however,

augmented, Paris, 1852;—A. Mayrargues: *Rabelais*, Paris, 1868; —Eugène Noël: *Rabelais et son œuvre*, Paris, 1870;—Émile Gebhart: *Rabelais et la Renaissance*, Paris, 1887, and second edition, Paris, 1893;—Jean Fleury: *Rabelais*, Paris, 1877;—Paul Stapfer: *Rabelais, sa personne, son génie et son œuvre*, Paris, 1889;—René Millet: *Rabelais*, Paris, 1892, in the collection of *Grands Ecrivains français*;—and finally the Notices or Notes in the editions of Le Duchat, le Motteux, Desoer, Burgaud des Marets, Moland, and Marty-Laveaux.

2. The Legend of Rabelais.—How it was formed;—the attacks of his contemporaries;—Ronsard's epitaph on Rabelais:

> A vine will grow up
> From the stomach and paunch
> Of good Rabelais who was drinking
> Always, while he lived; . . .

—Rabelais' quarrels with the monks;—with the Sorbonne;—with Calvin;—the declarations in the *Prologues*;—the general character of Rabelais' work;—and in this connection, that in spite of the tendency of the critics to make men resemble their works,—there was nothing either of the drunkard or the buffoon, nor even of the revolutionary is undeniable is that Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio only deserved to be called the "first of the moderns" because they were distinguished from their contemporaries by a characteristic sign, whose nature we shall attempt shortly to make clear. Still less can we disregard the consequences of the wars of Charles VIII., Louis XII., and François I. The truth is that for us Frenchmen our first contact with Italy was a sort of revelation. "Amid the feudal barbarity of which the fifteenth century still bore the imprint, Italy—says Michelet—offered the spectacle of an ancient civilisation. It commanded the respect of foreigners by its long-standing authority in religion and the pomp of its opulence and arts." It would be impossible to state the truth better or more accurately. The charm of the Italian climate and manners may be adduced as well. The Italy of the Renaissance,

about Rabelais.—Ginguené's opuscule dealing with "the authority of Rabelais in the present revolution" (1791);—and the notes in Esmangart and Johanneau's edition.

3. Rabelais' Work.

A. *The Sources of the Romance.*—Its mythical or mythological ground-work [Cf. P. Sebillot, *Gargantua dans les traditions populaires*];—and that it is doubtful whether Gargantua is a "solar myth."—Moreover it is not certain that he is a caricature of François I.—The Gallic ground-work and the tradition of the Middle Ages.—The Græco-Latin antiquity, and in this connection of Rabelais' erudition: *totius encyclopædiæ profundissimum abyssum.*—The writers of the Renaissance;—of some of Rabelais' borrowings: from Sir Thomas More [the Abbey of Thelema],—from Merlin Coccaie [the sheep of Dindenaut],—from Pogge (the ring of Hans Carvel],—from Cœlio Calcagnini [the allegory of Physics and Antiphysics, the Thawed Words],—from Cœlius Rhodiginus, etc., etc.—The historical allusions in Rabelais' romance;—and the satire of contemporary manners.—Imitation in a general way of the "Iliad" in the earlier, and of the "Odyssey" in the last books. [Cf. in Frederic Bernard's edition, Amsterdam, 1741, an amusing "Parallel between Homer and Rabelais," by Dufresny, the author of the *Lettres Siamoises*].

invaded, devastated, and trampled under foot by the men from the North, whether Germans or Frenchmen, subtly mastered its rude conquerors as Greece had done before it. They conceived the idea of a different life, freer, more ornate, more "human" in a word, than that they had led for five or six centuries: an obscure sentiment of the power of beauty stole into the minds of even the "men at arms" or the lansquenets; almost unawares, the whole of Europe became Italianised; and then it was at last that the spirit of the Renaissance, recrossing the mountains with the armies of Charles VIII., Louis XII., and François I., seemed to have destroyed in less than fifty years the little that remained of the traditions of the Middle Ages.

In this respect the Renaissance is without question the work of the Italian genius. When two or more elements

B. *The signification of the Romance*;—and it not being necessary that a romance should have a signification or a philosophy,—how is it that one is sought for in Rabelais' romance?—The Prologue to the first book;—two verses of Théodore de Bèze:

> Qui sic nugatur, tractantem ut seria vincat,
> Seria quum faciet, dic, rogo, quantus erit;

four verses of Victor Hugo:

> Rabelais, whom none understood;
> Rocks Adam to sleep,
> And his vast ringing laugh
> Is one of the abysses of the mind;

—and of the danger of seeing too much mystery and too much profundity in Rabelais' romance.

Of Rabelais' romance as a satire of manners;—and in this connection of the authenticity of the fifth book.—Necessity of fixing the dates: *Pantagruel*, first book, 1533; *Gargantua*, 1535; *Pantagruel*, second book, 1546; *Pantagruel*, third book, 1552.—Satire of scholasare brought into contact, to bring about or to complete the mystery of their combination, it is not sufficient (this is taught us by science itself) that they should have elective affinities for one another, but the intervention is necessary of a new force from without. It was much in this way that the Italian genius consummated the work of the Renaissance; it served as the spark. Moreover, if the Italian element were to be overlooked, not only would the true character of the Renaissance movement be misunderstood, but it would be difficult as well to explain the formation of *classicism* and the reasons of its long domination.

The primary characteristic of this new spirit is the *development of Individualism.* To be "themselves" is now going to be the chief concern of men; to be themselves to the utmost possible extent; and in consequence

ticism,—of monks in general,—of the Romish Court—of kings and the great—of the magistracy and of justice.

Of Rabelais' romance as the expression of the ideal of the Renaissance:—Rabelais' pedagogy;—*Pantagruelism*;—the philosophy of nature.

Of Rabelais' romance as a programme of reforms;—and that in this respect with regard to a number of points it should not have been displeasing to François I. any more than to Henri II.—Circumstances under which the third book was published.—Rabelais' moral and political ideas;—how far his book reflects the fact that he was a doctor and a physiologist;—and that he had been a monk.

Of some of the shortcomings of Rabelais' romance.—His contempt for women, and that in this respect Rabelais is a thorough Gaul.—What is meant when it is said that he did not possess the sentiment of beauty [Cf. Gebhart: *Rabelais et la Renaissance*].—He also lacked the sense of the tragic side of life.—That for all these reasons, the "filth with which he strewed his writings," as La Bruyère said, does not mark any depth of intention.—Comparison in this connection of *Pantagruel* with *Gulliver's Travels.*—Of Rabelais' obscurity; and that where he is obscure it is perhaps a question whether he always understood himself.

to be themselves "at all costs." Whereas up till now, men were humiliated, as they might be by a blemish or deformity, on discovering that they differed sensibly from others of their race or class, henceforth, on the contrary, if they think they detect in themselves an original or distinctive quality they will regard it as something of which to be proud. *Est sane cuique naturaliter, ut in vultu et in gestu sic in voce et sermone quiddam suum ac proprium, quod colere et castigare quam mutare quum facilius, tum melius atque felicius sit.* Such were already the terms in which Petrarch expressed himself in a letter to Boccaccio; and in fact men will make it a point of honour for the future to develop in themselves this *quiddam suum ac proprium,* that is, to differ from other men with a view to surpassing them. Nothing could be in closer conformity

C. *The literary value of the Romance.*—Luxuriance, richness, and complexity of Rabelais' imagination;—and that possessing in the highest degree the gift of seeing, that of depicting, and that of narration,—he even had the gift of inventing veritable myths.—Allegory, Myth, and Symbol.—Rabelais' humour.—The gift of provoking laughter.—Rabelais' style, and that two periods should be distinguished in his style;—of which the first is the better.—Of some artifices of Rabelais.—The gift of verbal invention;—how Rabelais let himself be carried away by it;—and while abandoning himself to it, rises at times to lyricism.—That Rabelais does not seem to have founded a school, and why not?

4. THE REAL RABELAIS.—That far from having been in any way the buffoon or the revolutionary of legend, Rabelais was the shrewdest and most prudent of men.—His relations with the du Bellays, the cardinal of Châtillon, François I., and Henri II.;—his squabbles with Calvin and with Etienne Dolet [Cf. Richard Copley Christie: *Etienne Dolet, le martyr de la Renaissance*, trans. Stryienski, Paris, 1886];—which nearly got him into trouble.—Rabelais and the Romish Court.—His appointment as *curé* of Meudon, in 1550.—Personal intervention of Henri II. in the publication of the fourth book, in 1552.—A passage in Théodore de Bèze: *Pantagruel, cum libro suo quem fecit*

with the spirit of antiquity, or more opposed, it may be, to that of the Middle Ages. Not only will men be desirous to "surpass" their fellows, but what is more, they will wish them to admit their inferiority. It is this sentiment that Dante somewhere describes as *lo grand disio d'eccellenza*, the keen desire to excel, and Boccaccio as the ambition to outlive oneself: *perpetuandi nominis desiderium.* A mere "latent" superiority, as it were, will not be sufficient; a superiority deriving its principal satisfaction from a proud but undemonstrative self-consciousness. The superiority will have to be publicly acknowledged, proclaimed and recompensed; and this will be the case, as we now know, not metaphorically but in fact. In this way the poet, the writer, and the artist find themselves condemned to an inevitable, continuous, and violent struggle for glory. In

imprimere per favorem cardinalium. . . .—He resigns his position as *curé* of Meudon in 1552.—His death in Paris in 1553.

5. The Works.—Neglecting some *Almanachs* and two or three brochures, the Works of Rabelais are confined to his romance, of which it is sufficient to indicate the principal editions, which are:

(Original editions) the editions of 1533, 1535, 1542, 1546, 1548, 1552, 1562 and 1564; and

(The complete works) the Elzevir edition, 1663;—le Duchat's edition, Amsterdam, 1711, H. Desbordes;—le Duchat and le Motteux' edition, Amsterdam, 1741; J. F. Bernard;—D. L. (de l'Aulnaye's) edition, Paris, 1820, Desoer;—and the more recent editions of Rathery, Paris, 1857, F. Didot;—Jannet, Paris, 1874, Picard;—and Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1868–1881, Lemerre.

IV.—The Amadis.

It is impossible to make no allusion to a book of the author of which its contemporaries said "that he was the gentleman of his time who had the greatest reputation *for speaking French well* and as an orator" [La Croix du Maine, in his *Bibliothèque*, article Nicolas de Herberay, Sieur des Essars];—and of the book itself "that there could be gathered in it all the beautiful flowers of our language" [Et.

every manner and by every expedient they are going to apply themselves to surpass their fellows, and by every expedient and in every manner they will endeavour to throw discredit upon those who rival them in popularity. [Cf. J. Burckhardt, *La Civilisation de la Renaissance en Italie.*]

Who has not heard of the famous quarrels of the Italian humanists, of their overflowing vanity, of the insults they bandied, and whose coarseness is generally equalled only by the insignificance of the matters at issue? Vadius and Trissotin will be "gentlemen" in comparison with Philelphus and Poggius. This is a natural consequence of the *development of individualism.* There will be other and pleasanter consequences, foremost among which it is proper to point out forthwith the revival or the birth of criticism. Who is it has

Pasquier, in his *Recherches de la France*]. See too on the subject of *Amadis de Gaule:* La Noue, in his *Discours politiques et militaires.*

The Sieur des Essars only translated the first eight books of the *Amadis*, which appeared from 1540 to 1548;—and the best edition of which is that issued by Christophe Plantin, Amsterdam, 1561.

V.—The Lyons School.

1. The Sources.—La Croix du Maine, *Bibliothèque française*, articles Louise Labé, Maurice Scève, Pernette du Guillet;—Goujet: *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xi. and vol. xii.;—Niceron: *Hommes illustres*, vol. xxiii.;—Paradin: *Mémoires de l'histoirc de Lyon*;—Edouard Bourciez: *Les mœurs et la société polie à la cour d'Henri II.*, Paris, 1886;—Charles Boy: *Recherches sur la vie et les œuvres de Louise Labé*, and vol. ii. of the *Œuvres dc Louise Labé*. Paris, 1887.

2. The Poets.—A passage of Michelet on the subject of the temperament of the inhabitants of the Lyons district [*Hist. de France*, vol. ii. Cf. E. Montégut: *En Bourbonnais et en Forez*].—Italian emigrants in Lyons;—the great Printers;—a town of passage.—Maurice Scève and his sisters or cousins, Claudine and Sybille;—Pernette du Guillet;—and Louise Labé.—Testimony of Billion and

said, what moralist or what preacher, La Bruyère or Bourdaloue, that at the starting-point of all large fortunes there are commonly found "things that cause a shudder"? This is precisely the case with criticism; for it would be vain for us to attempt to hide that at first it was merely a form of literary envy! In the meantime, however, and thanks to this very rivalry, men's characters begin to show themselves, even in France, in their works.

Here we touch on the reason that has caused some historians of literature to hesitate as to the place that ought to be assigned to Villon, for example, or to Commynes. Are they the end or the beginning of something, the last of our mediæval or the first of our modern writers? What, at any rate, is certain is that they are already *somebody*. Still more must this be admitted of Master

of Pasquier: "Continuing our story, and beginning with the town of Lyons . . . *it is notorious* that it is proud of having produced . . . the remarkable Marguerite du Bourg . . . and two very virtuous sisters, called Claudine and Jane Scève . . . and Claude Perronne . . . and Jeanne Gaillarde . . . and Pernette du Guillet" [*Le Fort Inexpugnable de l'honneur féminin*, Paris, 1555, Ian d'Allyer. Cf. Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, bk. vii.].—The *Délie* of Maurice Scève, 1544; and the *Rimes* of Pernette du Guillet, 1552.—The Works of Louise Labé, 1555.

Characteristics common to these works;—[Cf. *Délie*, decastich 331, 416, 418, 274, 168, 169 and 273; and Louise Labé: Œuvres, elegy i. and sonnets 8, 9, 14 and 24.]—The learned allusions and the intentional obscurity;—and in this connection of the symbolism of the Lyons school;—intensity of feeling;—the conception of love as something painful and tragic.—Mysticism and sensuality.—Growing Italian influence;—new concern for form;—new conception of poetry.

Of the connection between the Lyons school and the Pleiad.—Testimony of Estienne Pasquier: "The first, he says, to innovate was Maurice Scève of Lyons"; and of du Bellay [*L'Olive*, sonnet 59].—They applaud him for

having wandered
Far from the path traced by ignorance,

Clément Marot, of whose poetry it may be said with truth that it is full of himself and of himself alone; indeed the title of his first work, *l'Adolescence Clémentine*, makes this clear enough to us. In this volume he tells his own story; he lays himself bare; he exhibits himself to our curiosity. Similarly, in the *Heptaméron*,—than which, by the way, it would be hard to find less entertaining reading,—it is her own personal experience of life and men, it is even occasionally her own adventures, that Marguerite puts into her anecdotes. Need I mention here the name of Etienne Dolet, who has sometimes been called "the martyr of the Renaissance," though in truth he was only the victim of the overbearing violence of his character and of the excessive development of his personality? It would be easy to join a dozen other names to those given. And it is because it was the first

—and also for having broken with court, circumstantial and occasional poetry.—It is in imitation of Scève that the Pleiad will compose its *Erreurs Amoureuses*, its *Olive*, its *Sonnets à Cassandre*, its *Amours de Francine*.—Maurice Scève and Pontus de Tyard.—Personal relations of Louise Labé with Pontus and with Olivier de Magny. —Comment on saying of Cicero: *Nihil est simul et inventum et perfectum.*

3. **The Works.**—The works of Maurice Scève are composed, omitting sundry short works, of *Délie, objet de plus haute vertu*, Lyons, 1544;—and of the *Microcosme*, a descriptive poem in three songs, Lyons, 1560.

The works of Louise Labé include:—(1) a prose dialogue, *le Débat de Folie et d'Amour*;—(2) three Elegies;—and (3) twenty-four Sonnets, one of which is in Italian. They appeared for the first time in 1555.

There are Italian verses too in the *Rymes de Pernette du Guillet.*

Scève's *Délie* and Pernette du Guillet's *Rymes*, which had become extremely rare, have been reprinted at Lyons by Scheuring, 1862 and 1864.

The last edition of the works of Louise Labé is M. Charles Boy's, Paris, 1887, A. Lemerre.

time that the writer appeared distinctly in his work that there has been talk, and that it is still the custom to talk emphatically of the richness, abundance, and originality of the French literature of the time of the Renaissance. The fact is, however, that it is somewhat poor in works, yet poorer in ideas, and not less poor in men; and for very many years its chief originality will consist in the freedom, quite novel at the period, with which each writer will show himself as he is.

It is true that owing to the exercise of this very freedom, to this basis of individualism, another idea takes shape, which may be termed the central idea of the Renaissance, an idea of which foreigners themselves admit that François Rabelais was the living incarnation; we allude to the idea of the *goodness* or of the *divinity of Nature.* Its connection with the preceding idea is easily

SECOND PERIOD

The Teachings of Antiquity

1550–1585

I. THE RENAISSANCE OF POETRY

I.—The Formation of the Pleiad.

1. THE SOURCES.—Claude Binet: *La Vie de Pierre Ronsard.*—Estienne Pasquier: *Recherches de la France*, book vii.—Bayle, in his *Dictionnaire*, articles DAURAT and RONSARD.—Moréri: *Dictionnaire*, edition of 1750, article DORAT.—Goujet: *Bibliothèque française*, vols. xii. and xiii.; and *Histoire du Collége de France*, vol. i.—Sainte-Beuve: *Tableau de la poésie française au XVI^e^ siècle*, 1828; and *Joachim du Bellay*, in the *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. xiii.—A. Jeandel, *Pontus de Tyard*, Paris, 1860.—Plötz, *Joachim du Bellay et son rôle dans la réforme de Ronsard*, Berlin, 1874.—Marty-Laveaux: his *Notices* in the collection of the *Pléiade française*, Paris, 1867–1896.

2. THE POETIC SYSTEM OF THE PLEIAD.—The first meeting of Ronsard and du Bellay;—Lazare de Baïf's house;—the college of Coqueret.—Formation of the Pleiad.—Origin of the name; the astro-

seen. We can only develop in ourselves what nature has put in us, and nature had its reasons for what it put in us. The consequence is that in reality we are following nature when we develop our originality, just as inversely, or reciprocally, to obey nature is to assure the development of our personality; and such is precisely the "philosophy" of Rabelais' romance, or, if one decline to allow that his vast, uproarious laugh covers so much depth and mystery, such is at least the signification of his *Pantagruel*. He preaches the easy morality of the Abbey of Thelema, and "in his rule of conduct there is but this clause: *Do what you will*." However, on examination, this morality is found to go further than would be thought at first; it has a wider bearing if it be not of greater depth; and at bottom the rule of the Thelemites is seen to be the contradiction, or even the

nomical Pleiad; the mythological Pleiad; the Alexandrian Pleiad; the French Pleiad;—and to keep in view that in French as in Greek a "Pleiad" must contain more than six and less than eight names.—Romanticism generally in error as to the objects and work of the Pleiad.—Publication of the *Défense et Illustration de la langue française*, 1550.

A few words on the *Arts Poétiques* of Pierre Fabri, 1521; [*L'Art de Pleine Rhétorique*] of Gracien du Pont, 1539; and of Thomas Sibilet, 1548.—That to understand the *Défense* it must be connected with the intention of reacting against the school of Marot;—and that it is then seen that what its authors desired was: (1) *The Renewal of the subjects of inspiration*;—the fact being that for two hundred years, and even with Marot, poetry had been merely "rhymed chronicle";—while what was now to be undertaken was to sing the past, nature, fame, and love.—But to succeed in this, it was above all necessary to get rid of the restrictions imposed upon the liberty of the poet by the tyranny of fixed literary forms; and therefore:—(2) *the Renewal of literary forms*;—which will be those of antiquity: epic poem, ode, satire, comedy, tragedy, etc.—The sonnet, however, is spared in honour of Petrarch.—And finally to make these forms the vehicle of matter worthy of their beauty, it is needful: (3) *To Reform the* negation of all that manners, the school, and the Church had then been teaching for over a thousand years.

We have proof of this in Rabelais' commentary on or rather justification of his *Laissez faire*, in which he sets forth that "free men, of good birth, well educated, keeping honourable company, *have by nature an instinct and incentive which always inclines them to virtuous deeds, and restrains them from vice.*" This amounts to saying that Nature itself inculcates virtue, and it is in this connection that *Pantagruel* may rightly be called "the Bible" of the Renaissance. It is saturated with Naturalism, for throughout it gives expression to the conviction that all the ills of humanity solely result from not following nature closely enough and faithfully enough. But we need only recall the memorable allegory of *Physics* and *Antiphysics*. "Physics, that

Language:—by making a work of art of it.—Linguistic theories of the *Défense*.—How widely they differ from those of the "Greekifiers" and "Latinisers" at whom Rabelais scoffed in *Pantagruel*.—Insignificance of the metrical innovations of the Pleiad.—The innovations in rhythm will be the personal work of the genius of Ronsard.

Stir aroused by the *Défense et Illustration*;—Rejoinder of Quintil Horatian.—Hostility of Mellin de Saint-Gelais.—Counter-rejoinder of du Bellay:—Publication of the *Olive* and of the *Odes*, 1550;—The protectors of Ronsard and du Bellay:—Triumph of the Pleiad.—It is backed by the Hellenists, the poets and by the king, when Charles IX. mounts the throne.—It had already had the support of Mary Stuart and of Catherine of Medicis.

3. The Works.—*La Défense et Illustration de la Langue française*;—Du Bellay, *le Poète Courtisan*;—Pontus de Tyard, *Solitaire premier*, *Solitaire second*;—Ronsard, *Abrégé de l'Art poétique*, dedicated to M. A. d'Elbène, 1565;—*Préface de la Franciade*, 1572.

II.—**Joachim du Bellay** [Liré, 1525; † 1560, Paris].

1.—The Sources.—Marty-Laveaux, *Œuvres de du Bellay*, in the collection of the *Pléiade française*;—Sainte-Beuve, *loc. cit.*;—J. H. de Heredia and F. Brunetière: Speeches pronounced at the inauguration of the statue of J. du Bellay at Ancenis, 1894.

is Nature, will bear as her first issue Beauty and Harmony. . . . Antiphysics, who is ever opposed to Nature, was straightway envious of this so brave and honourable child-birth, and contrariwise bore Amodunt and Discordance. . . . And afterwards she will bear the Matagots, Cagots, and Papelards . . . and other uncouth and misshapen monsters in despite of Nature." [*Pantagruel*, book iii., ch. 32.] In fact it is in the name of Physics that Rabelais attacks what still subsists of the institutions of the Middle Ages. It is in the name of Physics that he draws up the scheme for the encyclopedic education of his Gargantua. It is in the name of Physics that he demands the reform or suppression of whatever interferes with the liberty of his development. He does not state his aims expressly, since he is not the prophet or the apostle he has been represented to be, any

2. THE POET.—A younger son of a great family in the sixteenth century.—The youth of du Bellay;—his severe illness and his studies;—his friendship with Ronsard.—He enters the service of his relative the Cardinal.—His stay at Rome.—Liaison with "Faustine";—Vexations and disgust.—Return to France.—Publication of his *Regrets*.—He falls out with the Cardinal.

The first verses of du Bellay;—*L'Olive* and the *Recueil à Mme Marguerite*;—and that du Bellay in these works, in spite of the very beautiful verses they contain, falls far short of his earliest ambitions.—He perceives this himself; and this is perhaps the origin of his melancholy.—His piece against the Petrarchists.—The very vexations of his existence with Cardinal du Bellay supply him with the subject matter of his masterpiece.—Originality of his *Regrets*.—The *Antiquités de Rome* and the poetry of ruins.

That du Bellay was the creator in France of "introspective poetry" and of the satire;—Comparison between his elegies and those of Marot.—He possesses grace, delicacy, and melancholy.—Also light irony.—Why it is that the ardour which marks his Latin poetry does not appear in his French verses [Cf. E. Faquet, *XVI^e Siècle*].

3. THE WORKS.—The Works of J. du Bellay are composed of:—

1. A collection of amorous sonnets, *l'Olive*, followed in the first

more than he is a buffoon or a drunken Silenus, and since in reality he has only one trait in common with his Panurge, which is that he has a natural dread of blows! But he does better than express himself clearly when he insinuates his views with an air, as it were, of their not being in his thoughts, when he urges them with involuntary ardour and almost unconscious enthusiasm rather than in a systematic spirit. Nothing in nature is repugnant to him; he loves all its manifestations, not excepting the grossest and the most humiliating, which seem merely to awaken in him the idea of their cause. Are they not what they ought to be? and can we do better than conform ourselves to them? *Ζῆν ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει*, the Stoics used to say in a formula that summed up the loftiest teaching of Pagan wisdom. Rabelais repeats it after them; he repeats it

edition by the *Recueil à Mme Marguerite*;—(2) of another collection of sonnets, *les Regrets*;—(3) of a third collection, *les Antiquités de Rome*, together with *les Jeux Rustiques*; and finally (4) of a translation in verse of books iv. and vi. of the Æneid.

The principal old editions are those of Paris, 1561, Langelier;—Paris, 1569, Frédéric Morel;—and Rouen, 1597, F. Maillard. The best edition is that already cited of M. Marty-Laveaux, in the *Pléiade française*, 1866–1867, A. Lemerre.

III.—**Pierre de Ronsard** [La Poissonnière, 1524; † 1585, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—To the works already cited should be added:—Gandar, *Ronsard imitateur d'Homère et de Pindare*, Metz, 1854; A. de Rochambeau, *La Famille de Ronsard*, Paris, 1869;—G. Chalandon, *Essai sur Ronsard*, Paris, 1875;—E. Faguet, *XVI^e Siècle*, Paris, 1894;—Mellerio, *Lexique de la langue de Ronsard*, Paris, 1895;—and Pieri, *Pétrarque et Ronsard*, Marseilles, 1895.

2. THE POET.

A. *Les Amours*.—Of the sincerity of Ronsard's love poems;—and in this connection of the amorous poetry of the sixteenth century.—It partakes rather of the artificial character of the "courteous poetry" of our old literature than of the passionate character of modern after the Italians; and by this I do not wish to say that he himself learnt it either from the Italians or the Stoics. I might make the assertion, since the allegory of *Physics* and *Antiphysics* is not his own, while assuredly he was as well acquainted with the ancients as anybody of his time. What seems to me, however, much more significant is that, in respect to this adoration of the energies of nature, he is merely the inspired interpreter of the current ideas of his time; and on this account his *Pantagruel* really possesses a significance that may be called, that must indeed be called "European." In a world that is still Christian, Pagan culture has made of him, as of the Italians of the Renaissance, a pure Pagan; and while others before him or among his contemporaries have been this, none has been it in a larger sense, with more verve,—and even with more lyricism.

lyric poetry.—Still, while this remark is just when applied to the *Sonnets à Cassandre*, it is already less so applied to the *Sonnets à Marie*;—and Marie seems really to have existed.—The language of Ronsard's sonnets; and that it constitutes, perhaps, their principal merit.—The merit is all the greater seeing that Ronsard often gives expression to very subtle sentiments in his sonnets.—Another quality of his sonnets is that they leave the impression of being the outcome of a single effort.—We know, however, that Ronsard corrected and rewrote them to a prodigious extent.—Were the corrections always happy?—However this may be, none of his lines leave the impression that they were "patched." [Cf. *Sonnets* 1, 20, 46, 62, 66, 94, 114, 133, 206 of the edition of 1584];—Voluptuousness in Ronsard's *Sonnets*;—how its ardour is always tempered by melancholy;—and in this connection of Ronsard's Paganism and Epicureanism.

B. *The Odes*, *the Hymns* and *the Poems*.—That it was Ronsard's *Odes* and *Hymns* that established his reputation during his lifetime.—Were his contemporaries mistaken in their admiration of them?—And what did they admire in them?—(1) *Their diversity of note*:—if some of them are "Pindaric," others are "Horatian; some of them are "Bacchic," some of them "heroic," some of them "Gallic" and some of them "eligiac."—They also rightly admired in them:

But there is more of note in this famous romance. For instance, beneath the humanist and the scholar there is little difficulty in detecting the Gaul, a Gaul by race and temperament, the continuator or the heir of Villon, of the *Roman de la Rose,* of the authors of our old Fabliaux. There is no example of an author breaking singly and at one stroke with a tradition several centuries old! And there is something of the monk, or more precisely of the friar, in the indelicacy of Rabelais' jesting, in the grossness of his language, in the license of his manners. It may be, too, that there is something of the doctor about him. Still, however diverse are the traits that give him so complex a character—and this very complexity is signally expressive of the confusion of ideas of the period —there is one of these traits, the one precisely we are trying to make clear, that stands out from, summarises

(2) *The variety of rhythm*;—and, in this connection, of Ronsard as an inventor of rhythms;—he created almost all those which our poets have used since, and he created some that are still unutilised.—(3) *The flow of inspiration*; comparison of the *Ode au chancelier de l'Hôpital* with the *Mages* of Victor Hugo;—how a descriptive or "objective" element introduces itself;—and causes their lyricism to evolve imperceptibly towards the epopee.

The epical inspiration of Ronsard's *Hymns*;—and that by dint of living in the company of the ancients he himself became one of them; —[Cf. *Calays et Zéthès* or *Castor et Pollux*];—He is as much at home in mythology as if it were his natural element;—and it lends him the power of creating myths in his turn;—[Cf. the *Hymne de l'Or* or the *Hymne de l'Equité des vieux Gaulois*];—But in these productions the purity of his outline is not always on a level with the vigour of his colouring.—Growing importance of description in the *Hymns*;—and of rhetoric;—[Cf. the *Hymne de la Mort* or the *Temple de Messeigneurs le Connétable et des Chatillons*].—From the epic form the poet evolves towards oratorical prose.

He does not quite reach this point in the *Poems*;—the reason being that he has first to traverse a period of alexandrinism,—[Cf. *la Fourmi*, *l'Alouette*, *le Houx*, *le Frelon*, *la Grenouille*].—Definition and dominates all the others. Rabelais was the first, perhaps the greatest, and also the most sincere of those of his race who believed in the goodness of Nature; who held that the great enemy of man went by the names of usage, custom, rule, authority and restraint; that in consequence this was the enemy who ought to be attacked by every method, by raillery, violence and insult; and finally that the supreme achievement of education was the liberation of the instincts.

But while he was making in this way open and cynical profession of his religion of nature, another sentiment, which he lacked, had sprung up and was in course of development in some of his contemporaries: this sentiment was that *Sentiment of Art*, in which, as we have seen, the Middle Ages were so grievously deficient and whose reappearance in the world is so characteristic of

of alexandrinism;—its three characteristic traits:—(1) *Indifference to the subject matter*, whence results:—(2) *The preference given to petty subjects*; whence results in turn:—(3) *A disproportion between the development and the interest and between the words and the matter.*—One cannot help noting these characteristics in Ronsard's *Poèmes.*—In consequence they would rightly be the most forgotten portion of his work, if they did not contain information of value for the story of his life;—[Cf. the Elegy

Since God has not fitted me to bear arms];

and for the literary history of his time;—Cf. *Le Voyage d'Arcueil* or *Les Iles Fortunées*];—and finally if he had not written the *Franciade.*

C. *His other Works.*—That it is not to be concluded that the *Franciade* is contemptible.—But Ronsard's heart was not in his work in this case.—Of the conditions of the epopee;—and that the subject of the *Franciade* realised none of them.—But the prose writer and the orator develop in Ronsard in proportion as his poetical inspiration declines;—[Cf. the *Discours des Misères de ce temps*];—and in this connection of Ronsard's Catholicism;—and of the relationship between the lyric form and the oratorical form.—Of Ronsard's *Discours* as evidence of this relationship.—The patriotic inspiration of the *Dis-*

the spirit of the Renaissance. Who is unacquainted with the expression given to it by Raphael in a celebrated letter to Baldassare Castiglione: *Essendo carestia di belle donne, io mi servo di certa idea che mi vieni nella mente?* I am reminded too of a sentence of Cicero: *Nihil in simplici genere ex omni parte perfectum natura expolivit.* The meaning of both writers is that our imagination never finds entire satisfaction in nature; that nothing natural, in any form, comes up to the idea we conceive of its perfection; and that thus we are always able to add to it a something that is our own. It is this doctrine, which inspired the great works of antiquity, that was spread abroad by the Italians of the Renaissance after they had elaborated it by thoughtful study of their models, and had endeavoured to realise it in their turn; and, as might be proved, it has modified

cours.—It was Ronsard's *Discours* that endowed our literature with the satire, though du Bellay may have had an inkling of this form of composition.—Ronsard's last love affair and the *Sonnets pour Hélène.*

3. The Works.—As we have enumerated Ronsard's principal works, it will suffice here to indicate the principal editions of them, which are:

G. Buon's edition, Paris, 4 vols. in 16mo, 1560;—the edition of 1567, Paris, 5 vols. in 8vo;—the edition of 1584, 1 vol. in folio, the last revised and corrected by Ronsard;—the edition of 1623, 2 vols. in folio;

And among the modern editions:—Blanchemain's edition 8 vols. in 18mo, Paris, 1857–1867, Frank;—and Marty-Laveaux' edition, 5 vols. in 8vo, in the collection of the *Pléiade française.*

IV.—**Jean-Antoine de Baïf** [Venice, 1532; † 1589, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Cf. above;—and add Marty-Laveaux' *Notice*;—and *l'Académie des derniers Valois*, by Ed. Fremy, Paris, s.d.

2. The Man and the Poet.—It being useless to study the poets of the Pleiad one after the other, for what reasons Baïf is given the preference over Jodelle or Remy Belleau.—Ronsard's caricature.—A natural son;—his youth and education;—mediocrity of his work. — That where he is at his best, in his *Ravissement d'Europe* or his *Hymne*

not merely the conception of art and literature, but the conception of life itself. "The language of the Italians of the Renaissance,—it has been possible to say with truth,—their ideal of society, their moral ideal, their entire being is *conditioned and determined* by the ideal they formed of art." [John Addington Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy; the Fine Arts*, ch. i.] In other words, the Renaissance, having rediscovered nature and freed the individual, perceived that it was impossible to trust the development of either entirely to chance, and it subordinated the imitation of nature and the development of the individual to the realisation of beauty.

The first of our French writers to experience, a little confusedly but profoundly, this new sentiment was a poet of Lyons, Maurice Scève, in his *Délie, objet de plus*

à Vénus, Baïf holds the same position with respect to Ronsard as do Primatice or Rosso to their masters.—Extensiveness of his work;—and that it is eminently representative of the artificial side of the Pleiad movement.—His orthographical reforms;—his metrical innovations;—his attempts to combine music and poetry;—his Academy.

3. THE WORKS.—Baïf's works are composed of:—(1) nine books of *Amours*, consisting of the *Amours de Francine*, in four books; the *Amours de Méline*, in two books; *Amours diverses*, in three books;—(2) his *Météores*;—(3) nine books of Poems on all sorts of subjects;—(4) nineteen *Eclogues*, which are more or less translations or imitations of those of Theocritus and Virgil;—(5) five books of *Passe-temps*;—(6) and four books of *Mimes*, which are the most wearisome collection of all sorts of trivialities and moralities.

The best and only modern edition is that of Marty-Laveaux.

II. SCHOLARS AND TRANSLATORS

V.—Henri Estienne [Paris, 1528; † 1598, Lyons].

1. THE SOURCES.—Niceron, in his *Hommes illustres*, vol. xxxvi.;—A. Renouard, *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Estienne*, Paris, 1843;—Léon Feugère, *Caractères et portraits du XVI^e siècle*, 1859; and a

haute vertu, a symbolical poem, imitated from Petrarch, the obscure night of which, if the expression may be ventured on, glitters with rare beauties. It is, however, the poets of the Pleiad, Pontus de Tyard, Joachim du Bellay, Ronsard and Baïf, that really perceived its force and revealed it to us; and herein lies the essence of the revolution they effected in our language, literature, and poetry. Their aim was to produce "works of art," and this ambition, which with them dominates every other, accounts for and explains their subsidiary efforts.

It was not, for instance, as grammarians, or, as we should say at the present day, as philologists, but as artists that they endeavoured to reform or to transform the language, with a view to rendering it capable of conveying their "sublime and impassioned conceptions," to

---

new edition, Paris, 1875;—Sayous, *Les Ecrivains français de la Réformation*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1881.

2. THE PUBLISHER, PHILOLOGIST, AND WRITER.—The Estienne family [Cf. Prosper Marchand, *Dictionnaire historique*].—A scholar's education.—Henri's first publication: *Anacreontis Teij odæ, græce et latine*, 1554.—Is the translation by Henri Estienne or by Dorat?—What is certain is the influence exerted on the Pleiad by this tiny volume.—Evidence drawn from the works of Ronsard and Remy Belleau.—Of some other Greek writers published for the first time by Henri Estienne;—that they are all of the second or third rank;—and that he translated them all into Latin.—Of Estienne's predilection for *Analecta* [Cf. the *Adages* of Erasmus].—The first Latin translation of the *Anthologie grecque* and the first *Conciones*, 1570;—The *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ*, 1572–1573.

Estienne's three chief treatises:—*La conformité du Langage français avec le grec*, 1565; *Deux dialogues du Langage français italianisé*, 1578; *La Précellence du Langage français*, 1579;—and their connection with each other.—Resistance to Italian influences.—Of Henri Estienne's views upon the relations between French and Greek [Cf. J. de Maistre, *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*, 2nd Conversation; and Egger, *L'hellénisme en France*, lessons 10 and 11.]—

use the expression of one of them, and above all in order to bring to light its more hidden and previously unperceived beauties. For words are something more than the signs of ideas, and a language is not merely an algebra or an organism : it is also a work of art. There are poor languages and rich ; rugged languages and harmonious ; languages that are obscure and others that are clear. Similarly, the reason they condemned the old literary forms—the ballad, the rondeau, the virelai, the chant royal, and "other like trivialities"—was that they seemed to them somewhat forced, jejune and antiquated ; and it was then that Ronsard, guided in his effort by the very genius of rhythm, himself invented so many varieties, that some are found in his work that have not been turned to account down to the present day. And lastly, what they attempted to appropriate

Henri Estienne's etymologies.—His frequent digressions and how almost all of them are prompted by his hatred of Italianism ;—by his Protestantism ;—and by his hatred of the Valois.—The result is that his love for his native language is all the more passionate.—Why it is that if the importance of his *Précellence* only lay in its title it would still be considerable.

Is Henri Estienne a "writer"?—and that at any rate neither the verve of Rabelais nor the artistic preoccupations of Ronsard are to be found in his works.—Is he the author of the *Quart livre de Pantagruel*, 1564 ?—His *Apologie pour Hérodote*, 1566.—In what respect the book belies its title and is at bottom only a Protestant pamphlet ;—Henri Estienne and Rabelais on the subject of "ecclesiastics." Comparison between the *Apologie pour Hérodote* and the *Quatrième livre de Pantagruel*.—Whether some few "tales" agreeably told justify Henri Estienne being ranked much above Bandello, as has been done.—That it is difficult too, to detect in the *Apologie* a foretaste of the *Provinciales* [Cf. Sacy, *Variétés littéraires*].—Is the *Discours merveilleux des déportements de Catherine de Medicis*, 1575, by Henri Estienne ?—His last years and his death in the Lyons hospital.

3. The Works.—The list both of the "editions" and of the works properly so called of Henri Estienne will be found in Renouard's

from antiquity was not its "science" or its "philosophy," but its "art": and by "art" it is to be understood the secret of awaking in the reader the impression of almost sensual pleasure, which the writers of the Pleiad themselves experienced when reading the Æneid or the Iliad, Pindar or Horace. How far were they successful? This is another question, which we will answer in a word by saying that they may have erred in the choice of their models, assuredly a regrettable and serious mistake for imitators to make; and they pay the penalty of not having been always alive to the distance that separates Homer from Quintus of Smyrna or Virgil from Claudian. They were uncritical or they lacked the spirit of discernment; and in their impatience to produce their work they did not always observe the conditions of fruitful imitation. Still, their example was not wasted. Into

Annales de l'Imprimerie des Estienne. We have cited the most important of these books; we shall confine ourselves in consequence to mentioning here the principal new editions, which are:

That of the *Discours merveilleux*, in the *Archives curieuses de l'Histoire de France*, by Cimber and Danjou;—of *La Précellence* by L. Feugère, Paris, 1850;—of *La Conformité*, by the same, Paris, 1853;—of the *Apologie pour Hérodote*, by P. Ristelhuber, Paris, 1879;—and of the *Deux Dialogues du langage français italianisé*, Paris, 1883.

VI.—**Jacques Amyot** [Melun, 1513; † 1593, Auxerre].

1. THE SOURCES.—Rouillard, *Histoire de Melun*;—Bayle in his *Dictionnaire*, article AMYOT;—Abbé Lebœuf, *Mémoires sur l'Histoire civile et ecclésiastique d'Auxerre*;—De Blignières, *Essai sur Amyot*, Paris, 1851;—Léon Feugère, *Caractères et portraits du XVIe siècle*, Paris, 1859.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—A passage of Montaigne on Amyot [Cf. *Essais*, II. chap. iv.].—Amyot's parentage and youth;—his studies;—his tutorships;—his translation of the romance of Héliodorus, 1547.—He is appointed *abbé* of Bellozane.—His translation of Diodorus Siculus, 1554.—His mission to the Council of Trent [Cf. de Thou, *Hist. universelle*, vol. viii.].—He is appointed tutor to the

a literature which ignored both the art of composition and that of writing, and whose masterpieces had previously been scarcely more than happy accidents, they introduced the sentiment of the virtue of form or of style; and while this does not constitute all that is meant by classicism, it is one of its elements or essential "factors."

If we now place all these characteristics in juxtaposition—the sentiment of art, the glorification or deification of the energies of nature, and the development of individualism—it has already been seen that they are closely dependent on one another. The very notion of a perfection that surpasses nature or that completes it can only be derived from the observation of nature, and only be realised in the work of art with and by methods that are themselves furnished by nature.

princes of the blood, 1554;—grand almoner, 1561:—and bishop of Auxerre, 1570.

Of some translators prior to Amyot;—Lefèvre d'Etaples and his translation of the New Testament, 1523;—Lazare de Baïf and his translation of the Electra, 1537;—Pierre Saliat and his translation of Herodotus, 1537;—Views of Thomas Sibilet and du Bellay upon translations from the ancients;—and what do they mean when they affirm that "the translators are the source of more profit to us than the authors themselves"?—The translations of the Greek poets in the work of the Pleiad [Cf. Gandar, *Ronsard imitateur d'Homère et de Pindare*].—Of the translators of Plutarch who preceded Amyot.

Of the choice of Plutarch;—and in this connection of some modern opinions [Dacier, Villemain, Ch. Graux in his edition of the Lives of Demosthenes and Cicero] on the author of the *Vies Parallèles*.—The attractiveness of biographies;—remarkable skill with which Plutarch puts his heroes before the reader;—moral tendency of his work.—That Plutarch in his *Scripta Moralia* touched upon all the ideas of his time;—and in this connection of a superiority of the writers contemporary with the Empire over the more classic writers of Greek literature.—In consequence Plutarch was the best author that could have been put before the readers of the time of the Renaissance.

It will further be noted that these characteristics, taken together or separately, are in opposition to the characteristics of the spirit of the Middle Ages. Not only did the Middle Ages lack the sentiment of form, but they were constantly suspicious of nature as of a teacher of error or of a power hostile to man; and the essence of their policy was the imprisonment of the individual in the shackles of his corporation, his class or his caste. And since every created thing bears within it, by the very conditions of its birth, the germ of its future death, it must not be overlooked, that just as the sentiment of form was capable of speedily leading up to the conception of a beauty independent of its contents, so the glorification of the energies of nature carried with it the possibility of an ultimate justification even of immorality; and the

Amyot's translation ;—and whether he has made more than "two thousand blunders" as Méziriac declared.—Opinion of Ch. Graux: "Amyot's translation is of real philological value."—That this point, however, is here secondary;—and that it is the style of Amyot's Plutarch that we are concerned with.—Amyot's translation naïve, natural, graceful and vigorous.—Comparison between some passages in Amyot and the corresponding passages in Rabelais [in his *Pantagruel*, iii., chap. xxviii., cf. *Traité de la cessation des oracles*] ;—in Shakespeare [in his Julius Cæsar, cf. *Vie d'Antoine*] ;—in Joseph de Maistre [*Traité des délais de la justice divine*].

Last years of Amyot's life.—His translation of Plutarch's moral and miscellaneous works.—Amyot at the "States" of Blois.—His *rôle* during the League.—His return to Auxerre, and his death.—General idea of the services rendered by his translations.—To what extent Amyot's work profited by the circumstances of his life.—A passage of Rivarol on the utility of translations [preface to his translation of Dante].—Duration of the influence of Amyot's Plutarch, and the reasons of this influence.

3. THE WORKS.—*Théagène et Chariclée*, 1547;—*Les sept livres des histoires de Diodore Sicilien*, 1554;—*Daphnis et Chloé*, 1559;—*Les Vies des hommes illustres grecs et latins*, 1st edition, 1559;

development of individualism that of the ultimate destruction of society.

II

This was not perceived at once by the Church nor even by Royalty, a fact that is sufficiently surprising! The Popes—at least a certain number of Popes—took a keen pleasure in making the capital of Christianity the capital of the Renaissance; and in France, Francis I., the "Father of Letters," either did not comprehend the nature of the revolution that was in progress, or only concerned himself with the immediate advantages he was able to derive from it. But when the general corruption of morals by which this self-confident enthu-

---

2nd edition, 1565; 3rd edition, 1567.—*Œuvres morales et mêlées de Plutarque*, 1st edition, 1572; 2nd edition, 1574; 3rd edition, 1575. Amyot has also left a few short works, such as the *Projet de l'Eloquence royale*, written for Henri III.; and the Apology in which he rebuts the charge of having been mixed up in the assassination of the Duke of Guise.

The best edition of his *Plutarque* is that of Vascosan [3rd edition of the *Vies* and 2nd of the *Œuvres mêlées*] forming 15 volumes in 18mo.

VII.—**Jean Bodin** [Angers, 1530; † 1593, Laon].

1. THE SOURCES.—Bayle, in his *Dictionnaire*, article BODIN;—Niceron, in his *Hommes illustres*, vol. xvii.;—Baudrillart, *Bodin et son temps*, Paris, 1853.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Scarceness of information.—Was he of Hebrew extraction? [Cf. *Ant. Possevini de quibusdam scriptis . . . judicium*, 1583].—Early studies of Bodin.—He starts with a translation of Oppian's *Cynegetica*.—His *Réponse à M. de Malestroit*, and the beginnings of political economy.—His *Méthode pour la connaisance de l'histoire* and his quarrel with Cujas.—That his protest against the authority of Roman Law, is of the same order as the protests of his contemporaries against the sovereignty of Aristotle.

siasm was followed began to be clear, when it was perceived that it was in a certain sense the very foundations of human society that were imperilled by this philosophy of nature, it seemed that at this price the miracles of art were being too dearly paid:—and the Reformation broke out.

Nothing could be more erroneous, or proof of a more superficial philosophy, than to represent the Reformation as analogous in its principle to the Renaissance, of which it is exactly the opposite. The only point they had in common was, that they both contributed for a short while to the emancipation of the individual. In consequence they were confronted for a moment by the same enemies, the schoolmen and the theologians, and for a moment they fought the same fight. Let us further admit, if it be wished, that in order to abolish a detested state of

His *République*. Bodin's originality;—his conception of history;—and that to appreciate him it is well to keep in view Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and Machiavelli's *Prince*.—He attempts to conciliate morality and politics.—His theory of slavery, book i., chap. v.;—his chapter on monarchy, ii., chap. ii.;—his theory of revolutions, iv., chap. iii.;—his theory on climates, v., chap. i.—He is a mixture of erudition and credulity.—Whether it can be said that he conceived the idea of Progress [Cf. his *Méthode*, chap. vii., *Confutatio eorum qui . . . aurea sæcula ponunt*, and his *République*, v., chap. i.];—Of Bodin as a predecessor of Montesquieu.

Other works of Bodin;—and how the author of the *République* is at the same time that of the *Démonomanie des sorciers* and of the *Heptaplomeres*.—Of the belief of his contemporaries in sorcery;—and that the Protestants believe in it no less firmly than the Catholics;—how does Bodin reconcile his belief in sorcerers with his religious scepticism?—History of the *Heptaplomeres*. [Cf. Guhrauer, in his edition, 1841, Berlin.]

3. THE WORKS.—Translation into Latin of Oppian's *Cynegetica*, 1555;—*Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, 1566;—*Réponse aux paradoxes de M. de Malestroit sur l'enchérissement de toutes choses*, 1568;—Six books of the *République*, 1577;

things, the one and the other, and the one after the other, found or sought in the present their weapons against the past. Here, however, the resemblances between them are at an end. Is not the second, moreover, most deceptive, if it be a fact that while the Renaissance made for the rooting out of Christianity in the world and the revival of Paganism, the efforts of the Reformation, on the contrary, were directed precisely towards bringing Christianity back to the severity of its primitive institutions? Is it necessary to recall in this connection the words of Luther so often quoted? "We Germans . . . resemble a bare canvas, while the Italians are tricked out and garish with all sorts of false opinions. . . . Their fasts are more magnificent than our most sumptuous feasts. . . . Where we expend a florin on clothes, they devote ten to a silk garment. . . . They

—*La Démonomanie des sorciers*, 1582;—*Amphitheatrum naturæ*, 1596;—*Heptaplomeres*. This last work only existed in manuscript until M. Guhrauer's edition of it in 1841.

There is no modern edition of the works of J. Bodin.

III.—THE ORIGIN OF THE CLASSIC DRAMA

VIII.—**The first period of the Classic Drama** [1552–1570].

1. THE SOURCES.—The brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*; *L'ancien théâtre français*, published by Viollet-le-Duc;—Ebert, *Entwickelungs-geschichte der französichen Tragödie*, 1856, Gotha;—Edelestand du Méril, *Du développement de la tragédie en France*, Paris, 1869;—Emile Faguet, *La tragédie française au XVI^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1883.

2. THE AUTHORS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRAGIC DRAMA.—The decree of the Parliament of Paris [17 November, 1548] forbidding the Brothers of the Passion to "play the Mystery of the Passion of Our Lord or other Sacred Mysteries";—and whether the Parliament in issuing this decree intended to sacrifice the *Mysteries* "to the Pagan enthusiasm of the poets of the New School"?—Italian origin of the classic drama.—Petrarch's *Triomphes* [Cf. in particular the *Triomphe*

celebrate the Carnival with extreme impropriety and folly." [Cf. Michelet, *Mémoires de Luther*; and Merle d'Aubigné, *La Réformation au temps de Luther*.] How was it possible for him to state more clearly, that what aroused his indignation in Rome, was precisely the spectacle of the Renaissance? Far from having any hold on him, it was the very splendour of the arts, the magnificence of the fêtes, the luxury of the dress that forced him into a schism. And in preaching the Reformation, it was not merely the Papacy as such that he was fighting, nor Catholicism, but it was the very spirit of the Renaissance that he wished to destroy and over which he was nearly triumphant.

I am not sure that the same intention is not even more manifest in the work of Calvin. We hold him rightly to be one of our great writers, and the *Institution*

---

de l'Amour, and the *Triomphe de la Renommée*];—Trissin's *Sophonisbe*, 1515;—Tragic drama in Italy from 1515 to 1550 [Cf. Ginguené, *Histoire littéraire d'Italie*, vol. vi., chap. 19, 20, and 21];—Lazare de Baïf's translations [*Electra* and *Hecuba*]; those of Bonaventure des Périers [*Andrienne*]; of Ronsard [*Plutus*];—the representations in the colleges;—Jodelle's *Cléopâtre*, 1552.—Hesitation of the Pleiad between tragedy and comedy.

The preference is accorded tragedy, thanks to Scaliger's *Poétique*, 1561;—thanks to the popularity of Seneca's tragedies;—and thanks finally to the success of Amyot's *Plutarque*.

La Mort de Jules César, by J. Grévin, 1560;—The determination of the characteristics of tragedy [Cf. Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, book i., chap. 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 16];—the choice of subjects.—The rule of the unities.—Jean and Jacques de la Taille.—Of the unity of tone of the tragedies of the Renaissance.—Of the advantage the writers find in treating well-known subjects, and even subjects already dealt with. —The utilisation of history in tragedy. The trend of classic tragedy is already determined in 1570.

3. THE WORKS.—Of Jodelle: *Cléopâtre*, *Didon* and *Eugène*;—of Jean de la Taille, *Médée*, 1554;—of Ch. Toutain, *Agamemnon*, 1556; —of Jacques Grévin, *La Mort de César*, 1560;—of Gabriel Bounyn,

Chrétienne is one of the noble books of the sixteenth century. It is certain, on the other hand, that no book could conceivably be more different from the *Pantagruel* of Rabelais, and that none can be named that is less "confit en mépris des choses fortuites," or that expresses less confidence in the goodness of nature. Nobody has believed to a less degree than Calvin, that it is possible for man, without aid and succour from on high, to escape from his natural "filth," or to prevent himself continually falling back into it. Nobody has been less of opinion, that we are justified in freely abandoning ourselves to our instincts, and in making the joy of satisfying them to the full the unique ambition of our existence. Nobody even has believed to a less degree that liberty has been granted us that we may turn it to account, for, on the contrary, he held that its rightful use lay in its abdication. So

La Sultane, 1561;—of F. Le Duchat, *Agamemnon*, 1561;—of Jacques de la Taille, *Daire et Alexandre*, 1562;—of N. Filleul, *Achille*, 1563, and *Lucrèce*, 1567; —of Florent Crestien, *La fille de Jephté*, 1567;—of Jacques de la Taille, *Saül le Furieux*, 1568.

Few of these works, with the exception of those of Jodelle, have been reprinted in modern times. There is, however, a modern edition of the *Mort de César*, Marburg, 1886.

IX.—**Robert Garnier** [La Ferté-Bernard, 1534; † 1590, Le Mans.]

1. The Sources.—Niceron, in his *Hommes illustres*, vol. xxi.;—A. Ebert, *Entwickelungs-geschichte des französischen Tragödie*, Gotha, 1856;—B. Haureau, *Histoire lettèraire du Maine*, Paris, 1872;—Emile Faguet, *La tragédie française au XVI^e siècle*, Paris, 1883;—P. Bernage, *Etude sur Robert Garnier*, Paris, s.d.

2. The Man and the Poet.—Extraordinary popularity of Garnier's tragedies;—more than forty editions in less than forty years from 1586–1616;—and were they represented?—His Roman tragedies: *Porcie*, *Cornélie*, *Antigone*;—and that they are simply history interspersed with lyric and descriptive interludes [Cf. the choruses; and in *Porcia*: *Description of Hell*, verses 45–66; *Description of the Ages of Humanity*, verse 725 and fol.; *The Labours of Hercules*,

much for the essence of his book. As for its manner, having regard to its monumental severity, there was never a book whose beauty was less "æsthetic," so to speak, or at the same time more logical. In no book has the art of the writer consisted more manifestly in being able to dispense with art, in renouncing every expedient, even those that are most legitimate, by which the feelings of the reader may be interested in the truth of the doctrine taught. In no book, to conclude, has assuredly vigorous thought adopted to express itself what Bossuet has termed a "sadder" style; and I fancy that he means a style more proper to discourage the reader. Such, too, is the opinion of Ronsard, who is disturbed, offended, and wounded in his artistic instincts by this gloomy Puritanism; and I was mistaken just now when I said that the *Institution Chrétienne* differs from no book so

verses 1076–1110].—Abundance of translations.—Influence of Seneca.—Greek tragedies: *Hippolyte*, *Antigone* and *La Troade*;—that Garnier composed this latter piece by combining the *Hercules* and *Troades* of Euripides and the *Troades* of Seneca.—Analysis of *Hippolyte*.—Noticeable effort of the poet in the direction of psychology [Cf. *Hippolyte*, verses 545–690, verse 1360 and fol.; verses 1963–2150].—The first tragi-comedy: *Bradamante*.—That Garnier's *Bradamante* marks a decisive moment in the history of the drama: tragedy "retreats" and gives way to tragi-comedy.—Glance at the state of the drama in Europe at the same period.—Whether this eclipse of tragedy is or is not a symptom of emancipation from the ancients?—Qualities of Garnier's tragedies:—loftiness of his imagination;—his style is that of Ronsard's school.—Further that he was mistaken in his view of the nature of dramatic action;—of the means of interesting the public;—and in the choice of his models.

3. THE WORKS.—They are almost restricted to his tragedies:—*Porcie*, 1568;—*Hippolyte*, 1573;—*Cornélie*, 1574;—*Marc Antoine*, 1578;—*La Troade*, 1578;—*Antigone*, 1579;—*Bradamante*, 1580 (tragi-comedy);—and *Les Juives*, 1583.

He is also the author of an *Hymne à la monarchie*, 1567;—and of an *Elégie sur le trépas de Ronsard*.

much as from Rabelais' romance: it differs at least as much from the *Sonnets à Cassandre*, from the *Ode à l'Hospital*, and from the *Hymne de l'Or*.

But this is why it is that we shall not be surprised at the resistance the Reformation encountered at first in France. France had not emancipated itself from the domination of scholasticism to fall at once under the tyranny of Protestant Puritanism. Having tasted the seductions of independence and of art, it was not going to allow itself to be deprived of them for the future. It had not cast aside what it held to be too "Germanic" in its constitution, as contained in the feudal system, in order to reinstate, in the shape of Protestantism, something at least as "Germanic." For this is a further point on which the spirit of the Reformation is opposed to that of the Renaissance; indeed it is perhaps the most im-

An excellent edition of Robert Garnier's dramas has been issued by M. Wendelin Förster, 4 vols., Heilbronn, 1882–1884.

X.—The beginnings of Comedy.

1. The Sources.—The brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*;—*L'Ancien théâtre français*, edited by Viollet-le-Duc;—Ch. Magnin: *Les commencements de la comédie italienne en France*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for December 15, 1847;—Rathery: *Influence de l'Italie sur les lettres françaises*, Paris, 1853; Armand Baschet, *Les Comédiens italiens à la cour de France*, Paris, 1882;—Ad. Gaspary, *Storia della litteratura italiana*, translated from the German, Turin, 1891, vol. ii., second part.

2. The Authors and the Development of Comedy.—The last *soties*.—That comedy in France is not of French, nor of purely Latin but of Italian origin.—Italian comedy of the sixteenth century;—its Latin sources;—its popular and national sources: *La Commedia dell' Arte*.—Influence of the "novellieri."—The personages of this comedy.—Disguises, misunderstandings and recognitions.—The plot hinges upon the valet;—and this continues the case until the *Mariage de Figaro*.—The Italian comedians in France;—the first troupe of *Gelosi*, 1571 [Cf. Baschet, *op. cit.*];—the second *Gelosi*,

portant point. When one attempts to arrive at the very essence of their opposition, it seems to lie in one of those racial antagonisms that of all are the most insuperable. Those who lived at the time overlooked this fact at first, but they were quick to recognise their mistake. They awoke to the necessity of choosing whether they would become Germans or retain their Latin race, whether they would follow the path that humanism was treading, or attach to moral preoccupations a greater importance than to those of every other order; and the differentiation of the literatures of the North from the literatures of the South was the outcome of this conflict. [Cf. Mme de Staël, *De l'Allemagne*; and H. Taine, *Littérature anglaise*.] It will be seen that it exactly coincides with the division of the Europe of the Middle Ages into two great "nations," which, separated for the future, will not

1577;—and is it a fact that they played the comedies of Pierre de Larrivey?

Pierre de Larrivey [1540-1612];—his Italian origin;—his translation of the *Facétieuses Nuits de Straparole*, 1576;—his comedies, 1579.—There is not one of the nine that is not translated or 'adapted" from some Italian comedy.—Declaration of Larrivey in his Dedication to M. d'Amboise.—It is also to be noted that his comedies are all in prose.—They are examples of the comedy of pure intrigue.—The principal point of interest in connection with them is that they were imitated later on by Molière [Cf. in particular *L'Avare* on the one hand, and on the other *Le Laquais*, i., sc. 1;—*La Veuve* (the author of the Italian original of which is a Bonaparte), iii., sc. 2;—and *Les Esprits*, iii., sc. 6].—Of a curious difference in the tone of the first and last of Larrivey's comedies: *La Constance*, *Le Fidèle*, *Les Trompeuses*;—and in what respect the latter are more romantic.

Of some other authors of comedies: Jean Godard, Odet de Turnèbe, etc.—The development of comedy, as that of tragedy had been, is interrupted by the success of tragi-comedy.—Was French society of the time of Charles IX. and Henry III. ripe for comedy?—Reasons for doubting that it was;—the principal of which is the license that be drawn together, will not again meet in the course of their literary evolution for a long time to come. The transition from the *homogeneous* to the *heterogeneous* is accomplished, and the work of differentiation will not be interrupted again. It is here that comes to an end with the history of the Middle Ages the history of "European" literature, and that begins with the history of nationalities that of modern literatures.

III

One of the first consequences of the transformation that is beginning is what has been happily termed the *Latinisation of culture*. [Cf. Burckhardt, *Civilisation au temps de la Renaissance*.] Little by little, and almost without being aware or conscious of what they are about,

---

reigned at the time in satire.—A second may be found in the circumstance that the national character was still unfixed:—what makes one race laugh has not the same effect on another, and the French character was scarcely formed.

3. THE WORKS.—Jodelle's *Eugène*;—Remy Belleau's *La Reconnue*;—J. H. de Baïf's translations, the *Eunuque* and the *Miles gloriosus*;—Grévin's *La Trésorière*, 1558, *Les Esbahis*, 1560;—Jean de la Taille's *Les Corriveaux*, 1562;—Louis le Jars' *Lucelle*, 1576;—Pierre Larrivey's first collection, containing *Le Laquais*, *La Veuve*, *Les Esprits*, *Le Morfondu*, *Les Jaloux*, *Les Escoliers*, 1579;—Odet de Turnèbe's *Les Contens*, *1580*.

P. Larrivey's comedies have been reprinted by Viollet-le-Duc in his *Ancien théâtre français*, vols. v., vi. and vii.

XI.—The Work of the Pleiad.

1. THE SOURCES.—Cf. the texts given above and add: Vauquelin de la Fresnaye: *Art poétique*, edit. G. Pellissier, Paris, 1885;—Mathurin Regnier, in his *Satires*, in particular Satire V. and Satire IX.;—A. P. Lemercier, *Études sur . . . Vauquelin de la Fresnaye*, Nancy, 1887;—Ferdinand Brunot, *La doctrine de Malherbe*, Paris, 1891; É. Faguet, *XVI^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1894;—and Marty-Laveaux, *La langue de la Pleiade* in the collection of the *Pléiade française*. It will be

it is to the Latin school that our poets attach themselves, though they continue the while to profess a great admiration for Grecian models; they are disposed to imitate Horace rather than Pindar; and this tendency is so general that even Ronsard, in his *Franciade*, but more especially in his theory of the epopee, though he invoke the great name of Homer, draws his inspiration in reality from Virgil alone. A scholar of renown, Julius Cæsar Scaliger, goes a step further in his *Poétique*, in which he openly proclaims the superiority of the Latins over the Greeks. Is it that he is alive to the circumstance that the Greeks, as a philosopher will point out later [Hegel, *Esthétique*, trans. Bénard, vol. i.], were only acquainted with the Greeks and barbarians, whereas the Latins attained to a knowledge of man? However this may be, towards 1560, or thereabouts, in spite of certain efforts,—

well to consult from a general point of view: A. Couat's *Poésie alexandrine*, Paris, 1882.

2. The Work of the Pleiad.—As regards style; it gave the alexandrine verse a definite footing in French poetry.—Comparison between the ten-syllable verse and the alexandrine.—The Pleiad put into circulation for poetical use all the rhythms which we employ;—it considerably enriched the language;—and in this connection what importance is to be attached to the reproach addressed by Ronsard of having "spoken Greek and Latin in French"?—The Pleiad also taught French poets and even prose writers the "intrinsic strength" of words; that is that in every language, and independently of their meaning, there are beautiful words and ugly words.—Of some exaggerations of the Romanticists on this score [Cf. Th. Gautier, *Notice sur Baudelaire*].—Finally the Pleiad set itself the task of raising the dignity of the poet simultaneously with that of poetry;—and it was successful.—Of the acclimatisation of the literary forms of antiquity in our literature.

The Pleiad would have been more successful still but for having committed three capital errors:—(1) It blundered in *the choice of models*, confounding them all in a like admiration provided they were ancient;—(2) It blundered as to the *conditions to which literary* such as those of Henri Estienne in his *Conformité du langage françois avec le grec*,—the language of Homer and Plato is seen to drop out of general circulation, so to speak, and to retire to the seclusion of the colleges. It is the object once again of the attention of none but the erudite. It is no longer to Sophocles or Aristophanes that the earliest authors of our "classic" tragedies and comedies will go for lessons in their art, but to Plautus and to Seneca. The imitation of "antiquity" is, or will soon be confined to the imitation of Latin antiquity; and thus it is that Greek, like a leaven that is only destined to contribute to a combination into which it is not to enter, is eliminated from the classic ideal after serving to determine it.

Be it remarked, moreover, that if Greek has great qualities, Latin has others, more suited, perhaps, to

---

forms are subject, thinking it could create forms at will without regard to time, place, or the laws of the human mind.—Theory of the *Epopee* considered as the expression of a conflict of races;—Theory of *Lyricism* considered as the expression of the personality of the poet;—Theory of the *Drama* considered as an encounter between the force of circumstances and the human will.—(3) Finally the Pleiad was mistaken as to its *real capacities;* it was not sufficiently cognisant of its deficiencies in the matters of experience of life and observation of man.

Still, and even as regards subject matter, its errors do not prevent its having marked out the boundaries as it were of classicism.—It was alive to or at least had an inkling of the potentialities of *style*;—it recognised in what true *imitation* consists;—and the nature of the transition from *imitation* to *invention* [Cf. on this head André Chénier, *Epitre IV. à M. Lebrun* and his *Invention*];—it communicated to its successors the ambition of putting the dignity of the French language on a level with that of Greek and Latin;—and finally it laid down in advance even the limits of classic art.—In this sense Ronsard, lyricism excepted, is already Malherbe;—and Malherbe, when completed by the wide acquirements and the integrity of reflection in which he will be wanting, will be already Boileau.

the nature of the French genius. "The dignity, it has been said, of the Latin language is unequalled. . . . It was spoken by the sovereign people, who stamped it with that character of grandeur that is unique in the history of human language. . . . It is the language of civilisation. Mingled with the speech of our barbarian forefathers, it had the power to refine, to render supple, to *spiritualise* those rude tongues which have become what we see. . . . Take the map of the world and draw a line within which this universal language was spoken: it marks the limits of civilisation and of the European stock. . . . The Latin language is the sign of the European" [Joseph de Maistre, *Du Pape*]. The Frenchmen of the Renaissance recognised this, and though they might have been unable to adduce the reasons just set forth, they were the reasons that induced them to return

THIRD PERIOD

From the Publication of the "Essays" to the Publication of "Astree"

1580–1588 * to 1608

I.—**Bernard Palissy** [Paris, 1510; † 1590, Agen].

1. THE SOURCES.—Bernard Palissy, *Discours admirables de l'art de terre*, edit. B. Fillon, vol. ii., p. 206 and fol.; Lamartine in the *Civilisateur*, July, 1852;—Haag, *La France Protestante*, article PALISSY, 1857;—Louis Audiat, *Bernard Palissy*, Paris, 1863 and 1868;—A. Jacquemart, *Les Merveilles de la céramique*, vol. ii., Paris, 1868;—Louis Audiat, *Palissy, sa vie et ses œuvres*, preceding Fillon's edition, Niort, 1888;—Ernest Dupuy, *Bernard Palissy*, Paris, 1891.

2. THE ARTIST, THE WRITER, AND THE MAN OF SCIENCE.—Of some extravagant eulogies that have been made of B. Palissy [Cf. the article alluded to by Lamartine, and Henri Martin in his *Histoire de France*];—and that the masterpieces of the potter's art do not de-

---

* I note here, without further delay, that the edition of the *Essais* (Montaigne) dated 1580 only contains the two first books of the work, to which the third was added for the first time in the edition in 4to dated 1588.

in a body to the Latin tradition after the brief and poetic enthusiasm for Greek by which they had been carried away for a moment.

Simultaneously, they feel the need of putting the solidity, gravity, and dignity of their matter on a level with the perfection of manner which they esteem they have achieved [Cf. Estienne Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, book vii., chap. 8, 9 and 10]. I see curious evidence of this desire, in the naïve and pedantic coquetry with which they resort to inverted commas " . . . . " to draw the reader's attention every time they express a general idea. The result is that while the Italians are already going astray prior to losing themselves entirely, as they will soon do, amid the subtilties of alexandrinism and become—according to the expression of one of the best historians of their literature [Cf. Francesco de Sanctis,

serve so much enthusiasm ;—there may be infinite art in them, but there is no great art where there is no great intention ;—and there is nothing of the sort in a pot.—Literary interest of the distinction.—Life and adventures of Bernard Palissy.—The famous passage in the *Art de Terre* [Fillon's edition, ii., 206 and fol.] ;—and that there is a great deal of declamation in it [Cf. Benvenuto Cellini in his Memoirs] ;—but it is sincere " declamation " or declamation of which its author is himself the dupe ;—and in this connection of Palissy as a writer.

That his self-opinionatedness is due to his ignorance ;—and in this connection of a form of vanity peculiar to the self-taught.—The dedication of the *Discours admirables* to the Seigneur de Pons.—Palissy's work bears witness to the state of mind of a " poor artisan " of his time.—It is this that constitutes its singularity, originality and naturalness.—His talent as a tale-teller [*Les ammonites de Marennes*, ed. Fillon, i., 48, 49 ;—the *Débat des outils d'agriculture*, i., 106, 107.—The allegory *Essay de la teste des hommes*, i., 108 and fol].—His sentiment of nature.—In his writings, as in his enamels, Palissy is one of those artists whose characters are not merely lifelike, but lifelike to an extraordinary degree.—The observer and the experimenter.

Should he be regarded as a " man of science " ?—For what reasons he cannot have had anything more than presentiments.—Testimony of

Storia della Lett. italiana, vol. ii., chap. ii.], almost "indifferent to the subject matter," whose form alone is capable of appealing to their senses, it is precisely with the "subject matter" or the essence of things that our writers are concerned; and it is to what they see, or think they see, to be the most durable and the most universal side of things that they endeavour to give expression. This liking for general ideas, or liking as it will shortly be called for *the reduction to the Universal*, is a second trait of the classic ideal that is beginning to take shape.

We touch here upon the explanation of the prodigious success of Amyot and his translations. His Plutarch is only a rhetorician; but this rhetorician has composed biographies which are perhaps the most interesting we know; and given the manner in which Amyot has trans-

Cuvier [*Histoire des sciences naturelles*] and of Isidore Geoffroy-Saint-Hilaire [*Histoire des règnes organiques*].—His attacks on the Alchemists.—Importance of the form he has given his work [Dialogues between a Theorist, or the *a priori* idea, and a Practical Man, or experience].—It does not seem, however, that he made any important discovery;—or laid down any principle in the sphere of method;—or formed a single disciple.—That his great merit lies in his having emancipated himself from the servitude of the ancients general in his time.

3. The Works.—*Recette vèritable*, "true recipe" by which all the men of France may learn to multiply and augment their treasures; 1563,—and *Discours admirables de la nature des eaux et des fontaines*; 1580.

The best edition of Palissy's Works is that of M. Benjamin Fillon Niort, 1888, Clouzot.

II.—**François de la Noue** [Fresnay-en-Retz (Loire-Inférieure) 1531 † 1591, Moncontour (Côtes-du-Nord)].

1. The Sources.—La Noue himself in his *Mémoires*;—Brantôme in his *Hommes illustres*;—Moïse Amyrault, *Vie de François seigneur de la Noue*, 1661;—Albert Desjardins, *Les moralistes français au*

lated them, it would be impossible to imagine more instructive object lessons. "If we feel a singular pleasure in listening to those who return from a distant journey, when they relate the things they have seen in strange countries, the manners of the inhabitants, the nature of the localities . . . and if we are sometimes so joyous and enraptured that we do not perceive the passing of the hours as we hearken to the discourse of a wise, fluent, and eloquent old man, when he is telling the adventures of his years of youth and vigour . . . how much greater should be the pleasure and rapture we should feel at seeing *human examples vividly represented* in a comely, vivid, and truthful picture." Thus he expresses himself in the preface to his *Vies parallèles*; and it would be impossible to state more aptly the nature of the teachings, or, as we should say to-day, of the

XVIe siècle, Paris, 1870;—H. Hauser, *François de la Noue*, Paris, 1892.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—As was Bodin, as was Palissy, he too is an "observer," though of a different kind.—His military career;—but his sobriquet of "Iron-Arm" must not be taken as evidence of his energy;—and that besides being a soldier he was something of a politician.—The scruples of conscience of a Protestant captain;—comparison between Montluc and De la Noue;—moral superiority of the latter.—His *Discours politiques et militaires*.—He composed this work in prison.—Curious points of contact between Bodin, Palissy, and La Noue.—Classification of La Noue's discourses: Strictly *Military Discourses* [11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18];—compare the manner in which he writes of war with a famous passage in the *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*.—*Political Discourses* [1, 4, 6, 12, 20, 21, 22];—compare the political views of La Noue with the "great plan" of Henry IV.—But of most interest as regards the history of ideas are his *Moral Discourses* [3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 19, 23, 24, 25] and among them Discourse 23 on the philosopher's stone; 6 against the *Amadis*; and 24 against the Epicureans;—La Noue a predecessor of Bossuet [Maxims on comedy] in his Discourse against the *Amadis*;—and of Rousseau in his Discourse against the Epicureans.—This amounts to saying that

"documents," relating to man contained by his *Vies.* In strict truth the influence of Amyot has not been commendable in every respect; and if it be indeed his *Plutarque* that may be said to have imbued us with that vague ideal of heroism of the Greek or Roman pattern, which will become the ideal of our classic tragedy; if it be indeed his Agesilauses and his Timoleons, his Coriolanuses and his Mariuses, that for two hundred and fifty years at a stretch will be the subject of French drama, or rather will encumber French drama without always providing it with adequate subjects;—then it is allowable to regret his influence. How would things stand after this if we were to enumerate here all our painters, from Poussin to David, who have borrowed off him? And are we to be asked to be grateful to him for that ideal of a false, sentimental, and declamatory virtue of which his

he is above everything else a "moralist."—The composition of La Noue's *Discours*;—their oratorical turn;—their vigour of language and style;—their impassionate patriotism.—Success of the *Discours.* —A few words as to La Noue's *Mémoircs.*—His death at the siege of Lamballe.

3. The Works.—*Discours politiques et militaires du sieur François de la Noue*; Bâle, 1587, François Forest.

There are no modern reprints of his works, and the most recent editions date from the beginning of the seventeenth century; but sundry of La Noue's Letters are to be found in a certain number of historical publications.

III. **Guillaume de Saluste, Seigneur of Bartas** [Montfort (Gers) 1544; † 1590, Montfort].

1. The Sources.—J. de Thou, in his *Histoire*, book 99;—Goujet, in his *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xiii.;—Sainte-Beuve, *Poèsie française au XVIe siècle*; and *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February, 1842;—Poirson, *Histoire littèraire du Règne d'Henri IV.*, vol. iv., 2nd edition, 1867;—G. Pellissier, *La vie et les œuvres de du Bartas*, Paris, 1882.

2. The Poet.—His Protestant education;—and that while profiting by the example of Ronsard, he goes back beyond him, and must be

Lycurguses and his Philopœmens, his Catos and his Brutuses, have offered the model to our publicists or to the members of our revolutionary assemblies? [Cf. J. J. Rousseau, in his *Confessions*; and Mme Roland in her *Mémoires* and in her *Correspondance*.] On the other hand, however, it is unquestionably in his *Vies parallèles* that the great figures of that antiquity which previous to him had been shrouded in a sort of mythological or legendary mist, assumed what seems to be an air of reality and life. Whether they resemble the originals or not,—this is not the point,—his personages are substantial, have ceased to be vain phantoms; it seems that one touches them with the finger. Indeed his own expression deserves to be retained: it is exact that he offers us *human examples vividly represented*, whose description has enriched our knowledge of humanity. Absorbed by the

connected with the author of the *Miroir de l'âme pécheresse*.—The court of Jeanne d'Albret.—Popularity of Du Bartas among the Protestant community;—Goethe's estimate of him [Complete Works, Cotta, 1868, Stuttgart, vol. xxv., p. 261].—His avowed intention of combatting the current Paganism of the time.—The *Première Sepmaine*, 1579, and the *Seconde*, 1584.—The *Première* has for theme the adoration of God in the marvels of nature;—the *Seconde* is a sort of universal history.—The descriptive and oratorical passages in the poems of Du Bartas.—Of the style of Du Bartas and of the absence of art that characterises it.—That together with Baïf he is responsible for the neglect that overtook Ronsard.—Of Du Bartas as a caricature of Ronsard.—Unavailing efforts of the critics to restore him to favour.—It is very difficult to account for his influence, but his work was very popular in his time.—Explanation of this peculiarity.

3. THE WORKS.—*La Muse Chrétienne*, 1574, containing the *Triomphe de la foi*, *Judith* and *Uranie*;—*La Sepmaine ou création du monde*, 1578;—*La seconde sepmaine ou enfance du monde*, 1584, comprising 1st Day (1) *Eden*; (2) *The Imposture*; (3) *The Furies*; (4) *The Artifices*; and 2nd Day: (1) *The Ark*; (2) *Babylon*; (3) *The Colonies*; (4) *The Columns*.

In addition to the above, in the posthumous edition published by interest of the narrative, we compare his Lycurgus or his Sylla with ourselves rather than with each other, and without perceiving what we are about. An unconscious comparison is instituted, of which the effect, if it be on the one hand to abolish the historical sense in us,—I mean the sense of the diversity of epochs—is on the other hand to teach us the essential identity of human nature. None before Amyot had brought this truth into sight; and if it should be thought surprising that a mere translator should occupy so considerable a place in the literary history of his time, let it be remembered that his "comely, vivid, and truthful pictures" awakened the vocation of Michel de Montaigne.

For whence comes the interest we take in all these personages, and what is its true nature? Montaigne

Haultin at La Rochelle, 1590, 1591, are found: *The Fathers*, and the *History of Jonas*, fragments of the 3rd Day; *The Trophies*, the first part of the 4th Day; the *Magnificence*; and a translation in verse of the *Lépanthe de Jacques VI., roi d'Ecosse*. The edition also contains the *Cantique de la victoire d'Ivry*.

IV. **Michel Eyquem, Seigneur de Montaigne** [Château of Montaigne, near Bergerac, 1533; † 1592, in the same place].

1. THE SOURCES.—Above all the Essays themselves;—Dr. Payen, *Documents inédits sur Montaigne*, 1847–1855–1857–1862, and *Notice sur La Boétie*, 1853;—Feuillet de Conches, *Causeries d'un curieux*, vol. iii., Paris, 1862;—A. Grün, *La vie publique de Montaigne*, Paris, 1855;—Th. Malvezin, *Michel de Montaigne*, Bordeaux, 1875;—Paul Bonnefon, *Montaigne, l'homme et l'œuvre*, Paris, 1893; and *Montaigne et ses amis*, Paris, 1898;—Paul Stapfer, *Montaigne* in the series of *Grands Ecrivains*, Paris, 1895, and *La famille de Montaigne*, Paris, 1896;—Villemain, *Eloge de Montaigne*, 1812;—J. V. Le Clerc, *Discours sur la vie et les ouvrages de Montaigne* preceding his edition of Montaigne's Works;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. ii., book iii., chap. ii. and iii.;—Vinet, *Moralistes français du XVI^e^ et du XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1859.—Gust. Allais, *Les*

will tell us: it is "that every man carries in his own person the model of the human condition."

> Humani generis mores tibi nosse volenti,
> Sufficit una domus . . .

The lines are Juvenal's, and without a doubt Montaigne is sufficiently nourished on Latin, his book is sufficiently that of a "humanist," or even it may be of a pedant, for one to suspect him of having borrowed the aphorism from the Latin satirist. This great reader is a great pilferer, and he has not always indicated his larcenies, as if he feared in truth that were he to have done so there would remain nothing of his entire book. A very useless precaution, but an almost vainer fear! Were the *Essais* only a collection or, if I may risk the expression, a string, a chaplet of quotations, that would

---

Essais de Montaigne, Paris, 1887;—D. Motheau, *Notice sur Montaigne*, introduction to his edition of Montaigne's Works, Paris, 1886;—E. Faquet *XVI*e *Siècle*;—Eug. Voizard, *Étude sur la langue de Montaigne*, Paris, 1885.

(2) THE LIFE OF MONTAIGNE.—The origin of the Eyquem family and Montaigne's pretensions to nobility.—His studies at the college of Guyenne.—He is appointed Councillor of the Court of Aides at Périgueux in 1557;—and councillor to the Bordeaux Parliament in 1561.—His friendship with Estienne de la Boétie;—and in this connection of the *Contr'un* or *Discours sur la servitude volontaire*, which is nothing but purely rhetorical declamation.—Death of La Boétie, 1563.—Montaigne's marriage, 1565.—Death of his father, 1568.—In 1569 Montaigne publishes his translation of Raymond Sebon's *Natural Theology*.—Of Raymond Sebon and his *Natural Theology*;—and he must not be confused with another Spaniard, Raymond Martin, the author of the *Pugio Fidei*.—In 1570 Montaigne abandons law for the army;—but he does not see any fighting.—In 1580 he publishes the first edition of his Essays. Montaigne's travels [June 22, 1580–November 30, 1581]. He is made mayor of Bordeaux in 1581.—The plague of Bordeaux, and that Montaigne's conduct during it was the reverse of heroic.—He ceases to be mayor in 1585, and publishes in

not prevent them being all that they are in the history of our literature: the first book in which a man formed the project of depicting himself, considering himself as an example of average humanity, and of enriching the natural history of humanity with the discoveries he made in his own person. "Every one looks beyond himself, I look within myself, I am only concerned with myself, I reflect on myself, I examine myself, I take pleasure in myself. . . . Others are always harking elsewhere . . .

> Nemo in se tentat descendere;

for my part I wrap myself up in myself." And by the comparison I make between others and myself, he might add, I not only know myself, I know others as well; I procure myself some notion of that general and common

---

1588 the real second edition of his Essays.—His relations with Henri IV.—His last years.—He dies September 13, 1592, leaving to his wife and his adopted daughter, Mlle le Jars de Gournay, the task of issuing the definite edition of the Essays, which is that of 1595.

(3) Composition and Character of the Essays.

A. *The composition of the book.*—A remark of Prévost-Paradol [Cf. *Moralistes français*] on Montaigne's quotations and the impossibility of separating them from the context.—But he has forgotten that the edition of 1595 contained more than "six hundred" additions to the text of 1588;—and, from a general point of view, that the distinctive character of the Essays is precisely their successive composition.—It is probable that the project of writing his Essays did not occur to Montaigne earlier than 1572 [Cf. book i. chap. xx.]. The edition of 1580;—and why good judges are of opinion that this edition is the truest reflection of Montaigne's individuality;—it contains fewer quotations, and presents in consequence a less pedantic appearance;—the arguments, being interrupted by fewer digressions, are easier to follow in it;—and there is something livelier about its general tone and style.—Comparison between the chapter on the Education of Children in the first and second editions.—The way in which Montaigne's text is added to and often becomes overloaded in consequence humanity of which I form part with them, and to which they belong as I do.

Informed of the intentions of the author of the *Essais*, let us now picture him in his library in converse with his favourite authors. He has been reading his *Tusculanes*, and has been struck by a sentence or a saying of Cicero; he then remembers having read something similar in Seneca's Letters to Lucilius; he refers to the passage; and he proceeds to compare Cicero with Seneca, and both of them with his own experience, which sometimes confirms theirs and sometimes contradicts it. Or it may be that, reversing the process, having first observed the effects of pain or passion on himself, it happens that in searching his Plutarch or his Tacitus he finds corroboration of his own experience; and he is surprised and pleased to see that Cicero, for instance, or Agricola have

of his wide and varied reading;—that Montaigne rarely deletes but is always making corrections;—and that he is much given to making additions.—Comparison between the Apology for Raymond Sebon in the editions of 1580 and 1588;—entire absence of plan and composition.—The scruples of the stylist.—To what extent the additions made in the edition of 1585 ought to be adopted.

B. *The inspiration of the book.*—The chapter: "To study philosophy is to learn how to die";—and that the chief concern of Montaigne's life was to overcome his horror of death.—This preoccupation explains: his curiosity with regard to himself;—differences in manners and customs;—and history.—His Epicureanism, which has sometimes been termed his Christianity, is to be ascribed to the same cause;—Christianity being, in fact, merely a preparation for death;—but in reality there was nothing of the Christian about Montaigne.—How his preoccupation with death explains the depth and the fund of human feeling of his philosophy;—a remark of Schopenhauer [*The World as Will and Idea*, iii. chap. xli.].—It is on this head that Montaigne is distinguished from Rabelais.—There is something morbidly keen and in a certain sense something pessimistic about his curiosity.—This is just the characteristic too that gives the Essays their singular value:—they are a confession;—the effort of a experienced before him what he has just perceived and noticed in his own person. In this way each successive edition of his book is augmented, enriched, and diversified with the material he lights on in his daily observations or in the course of his reading. It is in this way, too, that his pilferings reveal to us the very man himself, and that as he becomes a more critical reader and as his experience widens he perceives, and we perceive with him, that his nature is always his own,—but it is my nature and yours as well.

It is for this reason that, whereas "authors appeal to the public in virtue of some special and distinguishing quality," he is the first author to base his appeal on the characteristics he has in common with all humanity, to present himself "as Michel de Montaigne, not as a gram-

man to make the knowledge of himself the basis of a knowledge of the human race;—and an attempt to deduce a rule of conduct from this knowledge.—That the Essays are a melancholy book.

C. *Montaigne's style.*—The way in which this melancholy is masked by the charm of the style.—What did Montesquieu mean when he called Montaigne "one of the four great poets"?—Montaigne's style is a "perpetual creation."—The metaphors of Shakespeare himself are not more numerous, more natural, or fresher;—and in this connection of the metaphor as a cause and mode of the "fructification of languages."—Universality of Montaigne's vocabulary.—Sainte-Beuve's judgment on Montaigne's style [Cf. *Port-Royal*, ii. p. 443, 450, edition of 1878].—Moreover it is Montaigne's style that atones for what would otherwise be the impertinence of his constant talk of himself.—Strange details furnished by Montaigne about himself.—But by the way in which he relates them, he contrives to express what is human about them, as much as or more than what is individual and singular.

(4) INFLUENCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ESSAYS.—That "every man carries in his own person the model of the human condition";—and a comparison in this connection between Montaigne's Essays and Rousseau's Confessions;—the points of resemblance are external, but the differences relate to essentials.—Montaigne made moral and psychological observation the basis of French literature.—His

marian, poet, or jurist." What is to prevent him adopting this course? "Is not all philosophy contained in a humble and private life as well as in a life on more spacious lines?" Is it necessary to be Aristides to have known the ingratitude of men? Alexander or Cæsar to have experienced the inconstancy of fortune? And thereupon he adds: "If people complain that I talk too much about myself, *my complaint is that they do not even think about themselves*." We are ignorant of our own nature; and we hide or disguise our ignorance beneath the raillery we mete out to those who study in their own persons what is in fact the history of humanity!

Shall I insist further, or is not the consequence clear as it is? Instead of plodding, as they had done hitherto, in the footsteps of the ancients, instead of trying to pass

influence abroad: — on Bacon [Cf. his *Essays*, 1597]; — and on Shakespeare [Cf. Philarète Chasles, *Études sur Shakespeare*, Paris, s.d.].—Shakespeare's numerous borrowings from Montaigne [*Id. ibid.*]. —That in this respect Montaigne returns to the tradition of the European influence of French literature.—Certain matter in the Essays of a nature bound to be displeasing to another generation.—Testimony of Balzac [eighteenth *Conversation*];—of Pascal [*Pensées*];—of Bossuet [second sermon for All Saints' Day];—of Malebranche [*Rechcrche de la Vérité*, ii., p. 3, ch. v.].

5. THE WORKS.—Neglecting his translation of the *Théologie naturelle de Raymond Sebon*, 1569;—and the *Journal de ses Voyages*, which was first published in 1774;—Montaigne's works are confined to his Essays, of which it will suffice to note here the principal editions.

The *Essais*, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd editions, 1580, 1582, and 1587 [MM. Dezeimeris and Barkhausen's edition, Bordeaux, 1874, is an exact reproduction of the text of the 1st edition, and gives in addition the different readings of the 2nd and 3rd editions];—The *Essais*, 4th edition, 1 vol. in 4to, 1588, Abel l'Angelier [reprinted in Motheau-Jouaust's edition, 7 vols. in 18mo, Paris, 1872, 1875, Jouaust];—The *Essais*, 5th edition, 1 vol. in folio, 1595, Abel l'Angelier and Michel Sonnius [reprinted in Courbet and Royer's edition, 4 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1872–1877, A. Lemerre].

for, say, a Pindar or a Petrarch, our writers know for the future that they can find in themselves the material to put into and, as it were, sustain the literary forms of which they had previously done little more than imitate the outline. They will probe their own being. Should they fail to discover in it the reasons for self-satisfaction, a like inquiry afforded this Epicurean, their effort will not have been wholly vain, for its outcome will be the increase of the common treasure of humanity. And finally, since at all times and under all circumstances man's most interesting, instructive, and useful subject of study is man, we find literature is based henceforth on *moral and psychological observation.*

At the same time, the condition is enforced that a code superior to that of nature shall serve as guide, or, as it

We may also cite P. Coste's edition (it is P. Coste who is related to have blushed when Montaigne was mentioned in his presence), 3 vols. in 4to, London, 1724, to which is adjoined in the same *format* a volume containing the *Voyages*; Naigeon's edition, 4 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1802, Didot; —and J. V. Leclerc's edition, 5 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1826, Lefèvre.—This is the edition that has become the standard source of Montaigne's text.

V.—The Satire Ménippée [1593–1594].

1. THE SOURCES.—Almost all the more special documents necessary to or useful for the understanding of the *Satire Ménippée* have been collected in the Ratisbon edition, edited by Prosper Marchand, 3 vols. in 12mo, 1726, and published by the successors of Mathias Kerner.—In addition there is Charles Labitte's introduction to his edition of the *Satire*, Paris, n.d.;—and *Les Prédicateurs de la Ligue*, Paris, 1841, by the same writer.

2. THE PAMPHLET;—and that neither its merit, which is quite second-rate, nor its audacity, nor its consequences ought to be exaggerated.—It cannot be said that the Satire "gave France to Henri IV.," since it was published in 1594, and the civil war did not end until 1598;—there is no audacity: (1) in five writers producing a book between them, since it is well known that it is precisely on

were, as a law to this observation of ourselves. We are to study nature in our own persons, but it will be with a view to its discipline. On this point both Catholics and Protestants will be quick to agree, and here, if we may venture on the expression, we have the net profit of the Reformation and the wars of religion. As we have said, France had shrunk from the gloomy and hopeless morality of Calvin. His teaching, however, had one result: it left men convinced of the utility, the necessity, and even the urgency of fighting against the growing licentiousness of morals. Read in this connection La Noue's *Discours politiques et militaires;* Charron's *Sagesse* and his *Trois Vérités;* or again Du Vair's *Philosophie stoïque.* By different roads, all these writings, varied as are their origin and characteristics, verge towards two or three

the division of risks that the principle of insurance is based;—(2) further, there is no audacity in remaining anonymous;—and (3) in having published a pamphlet of this nature *nine months* after the *conversion* and *three months* after the re-entry into Paris of Henri IV.—The bravery of the authors wholly consists in consequence of having egregiously insulted men already vanquished, and in whose overthrow, moreover, they had had no hand.—The authors of the *Ménippée*: Pierre le Roy, Gillot, Nicolas Rapin, Jean Passerat, Florent Chrestien, and Pierre Pithou;—and that working together they have not displayed a talent that none of them possessed individually.—There is, however, a certain vigour of caricature in some passages of the *Satire*;—of satire even;—and almost of eloquence [Cf. the oft-quoted "Harangue" of the civic lieutenant, Dreux d'Aubray].—But there is not a trace of elevation or nobleness of feeling in the work;—the writers are middle-class citizens infuriated at finding their pleasures interfered with;—they are also pronounced enemies of the Jesuits;—and they doubtless loved their country;—but nevertheless the *Satire Ménippée* must not be numbered among the "great monuments of the French genius."

VI.—**Pierre Charron** [Paris, 1541; † 1603, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Bayle, in his *Dictionnaire*, article CHARRON;—

common ends: the first of which is to restore to the morality of all time at least something of its former authority; the second to withdraw the French genius from foreign influences, which are looked on at the period far less as hindrances to its liberty than as the causes of its corruption; and the third to demand of the individual, in the common interest of society, the qualities or the virtues which, left to himself, he would be inclined to spurn.

Of these three intentions, the first is specially noticeable in the *Discours* of honest La Noue, for it would be difficult to display greater concern than this soldier does for purity of morals, the education of the young, and the future of his country. Identical is the attitude of Guillaume du Vair in his "Philosophy of the Stoics,"

Franck, *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, article CHARRON;—Poirson, *Histoire du Règne d'Henri IV.* [see above];—Vinet, *Moralistes française au XVI^e^ siècle.*

2. THE PHILOSOPHER.—Enigmatical character of the personage;—he had been a priest;—he had even wished to enter the order of the Carthusian monks;—there were pious prelates among his protectors;—yet he had the reputation of being a "libertine,"—and the contradiction that seems to exist between his personality and his reputation reappears in his two principal works:—the *Traité des Trois Vérités* ("Treatise on the Three Truths"), which are: (1) that there is a God; (2) that this God is only known to the Christians; (3) that this God is only worshipped as he should be worshipped by the Roman Catholics;—and the *Traité de la Sagesse*, which has generally been looked upon as merely the systematisation of Montaigne's "scepticism."—That the order of publication of the works does not remove the difficulty, seeing that he was acquainted with Montaigne when he issued the *Traité des Trois Vérités.*

Examination of the *Traité de la Sagesse.*—Three contemporary, to say nothing of ancient, writers are copied unscrupulously in the work: Bodin [Cf. *Sagesse*, ii., ch. 44]; Montaigne [Cf. ii., chap. viii.]; and G. du Vair [Cf. iii., chap. xxviii.].—Meaning of these plagiarisms.—Charron's object is to make a synthesis of the ideas of his time;—as is a work whose spirit is sufficiently indicated by its title. The writer, forestalling Pascal, already aims at opposing Epictetus to Montaigne, the teaching that prescribes an effort of the will to Epicurean indifference, the philosophy of reason to that of Nature! We must live in accordance with Nature; but our "nature" is determined by the end to which we have been created; and "the end of man, of all our thoughts and all our actions, is to lead a good life"; and "our good" consists merely in "the right use of reason, that is to say in virtue." How different already is this teaching from that of Rabelais, or even of Montaigne! And, admitting that Du Vair is here only paraphrasing Epictetus, the choice of Epictetus as guide is in itself a symptom of importance. Experience has demonstrated the necessity of a

---

proved by the attention he pays to composition, a preoccupation that is the chief originality of his book.—The three central ideas of the work: (1) the goodness of nature [Cf. ii., ch. iii.];—and yet (2) the infinite wretchedness of man [Cf. i., *passim*];—which should breed (3) a sovereign contempt for death [Cf. ii., ch. ii.].—Connection Charron establishes between these three ideas;—his confidence in human reason;—in the power of the will;—in the universality of moral law.

That after this examination we are disposed to regard him as a "transitional type";—a forerunner of Descartes,—and of Pascal,—as much as a disciple and continuator of Montaigne.—Had Descartes read him?—In any case, it is certain that Pascal was very familiar with his works;—and in this connection that Pascal's annotators have been too neglectful of Charron.—It is generally recognised how easy, and at the same time how difficult, it is to bridge over the distance between Montaigne and Pascal;—but in reality the connecting link is afforded by Charron.—Moreover, he did not believe that it could possibly harm religion to establish its authority on a rational basis;—which is what he loyally attempted to accomplish;—and in this way his contradictions result from his having failed to grasp the significance of certain of his assertions.

3. THE WORKS.—*Les Trois Vérités contre les athées, idolâtres, juifs, hérétiques ct schismatiques*, Bordeaux, 1593;—*Discours*

moral directing force. The crimes of Catherine, the debauchery of Henri III., the corruption of the court, have filled the cup to overflowing. There must be an end to this state of things! And while waiting for the movement to terminate in a religious revival, an effort is made to establish on a rational basis, to secularise or to "layicise," the teachings which religion had inculcated in the past solely on its own authority.

To attain this end, our writers endeavour at the same time to escape from the pressure, the besetting pressure, of foreign influences. There are two such influences: first, the Italian, which during the long reign of the mother of three kings has spread from literature to the language, and from the language to manners; and in the second place the Spanish influence, the progress of which

chrétiens de la Divinité, Création, Rédemption, Bordeaux, 1600;—*Traité de la Sagesse*, Bordeaux, 1601.

The last of these works is the only one of the three that has often been reprinted.

VII.—**Guillaume du Vair** [Paris, 1556; † 1621, Tonneins].

1. THE SOURCES.—Richelieu, in his *Mémoires*;—Niceron, in his *Hommes illustres*, vol. xliii.;—C. Sapey, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de G. du Vair*, Paris, 1847;—E. Cougny, *Guillaume du Vair*, a study based upon new documents, Paris, 1857.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Undeserved oblivion into which Du Vair has fallen;—although he was bishop and Count of Lisieux;—First President of the Parliament of Provence;—and twice Keeper of the Seals of France;—or perhaps it is because he held these offices that he is forgotten.—The truth is, his political career does not seem to have added greatly to his reputation [Cf. Bazin, *Histoire de France sous le règne de Louis XIII.*]—Moreover, he has not left his mark on the history of the Church;—having only been appointed bishop of Lisieux when over sixty years old;—but he was a great lover of literature;—and he did more for French oratory than any of his predecessors;—by his translations of Aeschines, Demosthenes and Cicero [*Pour* and *Contre Ctésiphon* and *Pour Milon*];—by the series

throughout Europe has kept pace with the political or military successes achieved by Charles V. and Philip II. While the women of France were bestowing their admiration on the romantic qualities of the *Amadis*, the language of current use was becoming loaded and disfigured by Italianisms. Henry Estienne has drawn up a list of the military terms and the terms in vogue at court, of the terms relating to the arts and those relating to debauchery that invaded our vocabulary, and all, or almost all, of which have since retained their place there. The protest of La Noue, in his *Discours sur les Amadis*, against the taste for romances and against the imitation of Spanish manners was equally unavailing. It might seem at first sight that the authors of the *Satire Ménippée* were more successful, but has not the political importance

of his *Arrêts rendus en robe rouge*;—and by his very delicate perception of the qualities the language was still wanting in [Cf. his *Traité de l'Eloqucnce française, et des raisons pour quoi elle est démeurée si basse*].

Furthermore, he exerted a really important influence as a philosopher.—Of his translation of the Manual of Epictetus and of his *Traité de la philosophie des Stoïques*.—In what respect his work is related to and throws light on that of Charron;—but he was mixed up in public affairs to a greater extent than Charron, and in consequence he has the advantage of the latter as regards experience; —his field of psychological and moral observation is proportionately wider.—His conception, too, of the dignity of reason and of the power of the will is more "Stoic";—and in consequence loftier in the measure in which the Stoic point of view is loftier than that of the Epicureans.—And to conclude, in his *Traité de la sainte philosophie* he takes the final step:—after having essayed to secularise morality, he renounces the effort;—and failing to see a remedy for the prevailing corruption except in a return to Christian morality, he asserts the necessity of this return.—Analogy between this evolution and that of the thought of Pascal.—The *Traités philosophiques* of Du Vair are as necessary as *La Sagesse* to an understanding of the movement from which Jansenism is to be evolved.

of this celebrated pamphlet been somewhat exaggerated? In any case, and supposing it to have been as effective as several armies, its literary importance is not much more considerable on that account. But here again, as above, the symptom is significant. There has been brought into being a spirit of resistance against the enthusiasm of the Pleiad and the infatuation of the courtiers for everything Italian or Spanish. Moreover, a goal has come into view: a goal which, though it will not be reached at once, will not be lost sight of for the future. The "nationalisation" of French literature, impossible as circumstances for the time being may render its realisation, has become the object at which writers, society and even royalty, are about to aim; in a word, the classic ideal may be only vaguely self-conscious as yet,

3. THE WORKS.—There being very many editions of Du Vair, in enumerating his works here we follow the order observed in what has seemed to us the most complete edition, that published at Cologne by Pierre Aubert in 1617.[1]—(1) *Actions et Traités oratoires*, 1586–1614, among which are to be noted: *Exhortation à la paix adressée a ceux de la Ligue* and *Suasion de l'arrêt pour la loi salique au Parlement*;—(2) *De l'Eloquence française*, including the treatise properly so called and the three translations cited above;—(3) *Arrêts prononcés en robe rouge*, of which there are three more in the folio edition of 1641 than in the edition of 1617, or in all eight;—(4) *Philosophic treatises*, including, in addition to the works already cited, a *Traité de la Constance* and an *Exhortation à la vie civile*;—(5) *Treatises on piety* and *Meditations*, including the *Traité de la sainte philosophie* and *Meditations* on the Lord's Prayer, the Canticle of Ezekiel, the Psalms of Penitence, etc., etc.

We do not know of a modern edition of Du Vair.

VIII.—**François de Sales** [Château of Thorens, in Savoy, 1567; † Lyons, 1622].

---

[1] We have been unable to fix the exact dates of the first publication of the separate works of Du Vair; and we would remark, for instance, that the date assigned to his *Traités philosophiques*, 1606, is certainly erroneous, since entire passages from it are found in *La Sagesse* of Charron, who died in 1603.

but nevertheless it is already in existence. Similarly, a man of genius or talent may spend his youth in confused agitation, may appear to fritter away or even to dissipate his energy, whereas all the while an inner force keeps him from straying and directs him to his goal; and his originality only gains by the chequered nature of his experiences.

Again Guillaume du Vair has written in one of his works: "Of all the benefits procured us by civil society, there is none we should rate more highly or set greater store on than the friendship of honourable men; *for it is the foundation and pivot of our felicity. It shapes our whole existence, it sweetens the bitterness of life, it gives savour to the pleasant experiences that befall us.* In prosperity it gives us persons to whom we may render

1. THE SOURCES.—Charles-Auguste de Sales, *Histoire du bienheureux François de Sales*, 1634;—Bossuet, *Panégyrique de François de Sales*, 1662;—*Bulle de canonisation de Saint François de Sales*, 1665;—Sainte-Beuve: *Port-Royal*, book i., chap. ix. and x., and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vii.;—A. Sayous: *La littérature française à l'étranger*, vol. i., chap. i. and ii.; Paris, 1853;—Robiou: *Essai sur la littérature et les mœurs pendant la première moitié du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1858;—F. Strowski, *Saint-François de Sales*, Paris, 1898;—dom Mackey's Notices in the edition of the Works, Annecy, 1892 and following years.[1]

2. THE CONTROVERSIALIST, THE WRITER, THE ORATOR.—François de Sales has his place in literary history as a controversialist, an "ascetic" writer and a preacher.—His family and education.—The college of Clermont and the university of Padua [Cf. Antonio Favaro: *Galileo Galilei e lo studio di Padova*, Florence, 1883]. The early career of François de Sales.—His meeting with Théodore de Bèze.—The mission to Chablais [1594–1598];—and the first writings of François de Sales: *Les Controverses* and the *Défense de l'étendard de la Croix*.—The keen perspicacity and clearness of argument with which he reduces the essentials of the controversy between Protestants

---

[1] We naturally do not feel called upon to enumerate here the very numerous publications belonging rather to hagiography than to literary history.

service and with whom we may rejoice at our good fortune, in affliction persons to aid and console us, in our youth persons to advise and instruct us, in old age persons to help us and reason with us, and in manhood persons to assist and second us." At first sight one is tempted to consider these words merely as the expression of a commonplace of morality. But when one weighs them "as with the scales of the goldsmiths"; and further when one considers them in connection with the historical events of the period; when one reflects, in fact, that they were penned at a time when the pacific policy inseparably connected with the most glorious years of the reign of Henri IV. was yielding its results, they seem to acquire fresh significance. While suffering from the combined evils of foreign and civil war, people learned

and Catholics to the matter of the unity of Church.—His sojourn in Paris in 1602;—and the *Oraison funèbre du duc de Mercœur*.—He is ordained bishop of Geneva, 1602.

Of the *Introduction à la vie dévote* [Cf. Jules Very, *La Philothée de St. François de Sales*, Geneva, 1878];—and in what respect François de Sales continues the work of Du Vair in this book.—Charm and seduction of the book.—The "harmonies of nature" in François de Sales' book.—He is the first of the several Savoyards who will contribute to the glory of French literature [Cf. Sayous, *Littérature française à l'étranger*].—How far can he be said to have rendered piety accessible, fashionable, and attractive?—In reality his doctrine is severe;—and that had he presented it in a different manner it would no longer have been Christianity, but Stoicism.—The *Traité de l'amour de Dieu*.

Of François de Sales as a preacher;—and why has he been omitted from among the "forerunners of Bossuet" [Cf. Jacquinet: *Les prédicateurs du XVII^e^ siècle avant Bossuet*;—and Freppel: *Bossuet et l'eloquence sacrée au XVII^e^ siècle*].—Comparison between the "Sermon for the Fête of the Assumption" and Bossuet's sermon, on the same subject.—Utility of comparisons of this kind, and that there is no surer method of characterising the different preachers.—Another comparison between the "Sermon for Twelth Night" and to appreciate the incomparable importance of the social fabric, and awoke to the fact that its destruction or weakening is the direst of misfortunes. The belief that the aim of the individual should be the free development of the forces with which nature has endowed him, falls into disrepute; and the belief is abandoned too, of the author of the *Essais*, that men, like nuts in a sack, always end by "making a heap" by settling down in a sort of inertia born of habit, that bears a resemblance to order. But just as bodily health, which is thought to be a gift of nature, is really the outcome of adherence to a system of hygiene, and, in consequence, of an appropriate "effort," so to enable society to maintain its equilibrium, it is not sufficient that it be left to itself, but on the contrary this stability demands

Fenelon's sermon on the same subject.—The *Traité de la prédication* and the rhetoric of François de Sales.—"The sovereign artifice is to dispense with artifice."—Whether François de Sales has always observed his own precept?—That there is a certain affectation, a certain striving after "prettiness" and intentional simplicity in his manner.

3. THE WORKS.—They fall into two groups: Polemical Works and Ascetic Works. The first includes: *Les Controverses*,—the *Défense de l'estendard de la Croix*,—and some shorter works of less importance.—The second group includes the *Introduction à la vie dévote*, 1608;—the *Traité de l'Amour de Dieu*, 1612;—and the *Entretiens spirituels*, which were not published until 1629.—To these works must be added a few opuscules, notably the opuscule *Degrès d'oraison*, the *Lettres Spirituelles ou de direction* and the *Sermons*.—The lay correspondence of the Saint also deserves to be read.

Few books have had so many editions as the *Introduction à la vie dévote*.—There are two good editions of the complete works, but they will be superseded henceforth by an edition at present in course of publication "under the supervision of the nuns of the Visitation of the first monastery of Annecy," and under the direction of the Reverend dom Mackey, O.S.B. Eight volumes of this edition have already appeared; Annecy, printed by Niérat.

a constant personal effort on the part of each one of us.

Such is the meaning of the excellent Du Vair, and of a like way of feeling and thinking are the Canon of Condom, Pierre Charron, author of the *Traité de la Sagesse*; Honoré d'Urfé, the Forezian gentleman, the unhappy husband of the beautiful Diane de Chateaumorand, and the author of that *Astrée* which is about to become the code of polite society; and François de Sales as we see from his *Introduction à la vie dévote.* We do not exist for ourselves alone, but for other men as well; and what is more, we can only reach our full development as the result of commerce with our fellows. In consequence, in the interest of human society, and therefore in our own individual and personal interest, let each of us

IX.—**Mathurin Regnier** [Chartres, 1573 ; † 1613, Rouen].

1. The Sources.—Goujet in his *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xiv. ;—Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVIe siècle*; *Mathurin Regnier et Andre Chénier*, 1829 ;—Viollet-le-Duc, Notice preceding his edition of the *Satires*, 1853 ;—Robiou, *Essai sur l'histoire de la littérature et des mœurs*, etc., Paris, 1858 ;—Garsonnet, *Etude sur Mathurin Regnier*, Paris, 1859 and 1877 ;—Courbet, Notice preceding his edition of the *Satires*, Paris, 1875 ;—J. Vianey, *Mathurin Regnier*, Paris, 1896.

2. The Man and the Poet.—That Regnier, even when he begins to write, is already behind his time,—as a libertine, who is bent on keeping up the licentious traditions of another age ;—and as a disciple of Ronsard, whom he copies outrageously.—His qualities :—a freedom of expression and plainness of language that often degenerate into grossness [Cf. *Satire* xiii.] ;—the gift of observing, depicting, and satirising [Cf. *Satire* viii.] ;—at least apparent if not always real ease and naturalness [Cf. *Satires* iii. and vii.].—His defects :—solecisms and prolixity [Cf. *Satire* i.] ;—want of taste and inartisticness [Cf. *Satire* x.] :

> His carelessness is his chief artifice.

—lack of invention and of ideas.—What is the reason of his renounce in a measure that egoism that comes, it must be confessed, so natural to us! We shall be more than repaid for the sacrifices we may have to make by the pleasures the increased amenity of life will offer. Since we all of us stand in continual need of one another, let us arrange to live on a footing of "honourable friendship," of friendship which, from being a service or a help, will become sooner or later a pleasure. Let us organise our life on a social basis, and in such a way that, in addition to an habitual exchange of services, it shall embrace an exchange of sentiments or ideas. Let us multiply our occasions of meeting, since to do so will be to multiply the means of arriving at a mutual understanding; and from each of us will be evolved, as it were, a social type without any distin-

reputation?—It is due to the fact that Boileau was pleased to drag him from obscurity;—to the fact that he is a Gaul;—and to the fact that in a certain sense, on account of the vigour of some of his lines, he is one of the links between Rabelais, for instance, and Molière.

3. The Works.—Putting aside some epigrams,—two elegies;—and a few obscene pieces that have found their way into the *Cabinet satyrique*;—the works of Regnier are restricted to his *Satires*, of which there are in all nineteen.

The best edition is that of Courbet, Paris, 1875, Lemerre;—in which two opuscules of M. Dezeimeris, Bordeaux, 1876 and 1880;—and the researches of M. Vianey [1896] would permit of numerous improvements still being made.

X.—**Honoré d'Urfé** [Marseilles, 1568; † 1625, Villefranche, Alpes-Maritimes].

1. The Sources.—D'Urfé himself in several episodes of his *Astrée*, which are merely incidents of his life "put into a romance";—Patru, *Eclaircissements sur l'histoire de l'Astrée* in the *Plaidoyers et œuvres diverses de M. Patru*, Paris, 1681, Mabre-Cramoisy;—Auguste Bernard, *Les d'Urfé*, Paris, 1839;—Norbert Bonafous, *Études sur l'Astrée et Honoré d'Urfé*, Paris, 1846;—Louis de Loménie, *L'Astrée et le roman pastoral* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for July 15,

guishing "sign," or, as would be said at the present day, without any "speciality." We touch here on the fundamental idea of classicism, and for one hundred and fifty or two hundred years the history of French literature will be merely the history of the transformations or the development of this governing idea.

Thus, when we come to determine in a few words the progress made, we are offered the spectacle, during the last years of the reign of Henri IV., of an original and national literature endeavouring to emancipate itself from the imitation of foreign literatures. To judge from the most characteristic of the symptoms we have enumerated, this literature will prove more especially "social"; by which is meant that it will set itself the task of preserving, developing, and perfecting the social

1858;—Emile Montégut, *En Bourbonnais et en Forez*, Paris, 1880;—Körting, *Geschichte des Französischen Romans im XVII Jahrhundert*, Leipsic and Oppeln, 1885–1887.

2. THE SOURCE OF THE ASTRÉE.—Biography of Honoré d'Urfé;—his first work: The *Epistres Morales*, 1598;—his marriage with Diane de Chateaumorand;—his conjugal misfortunes;—his poem *Le Sireine*, 1606.—The framework of the *Astrée*.—The mingling of fiction and reality [Cf. Patru, *Eclaircissements*, etc.].—The background of the narrative and the *Diana enamorada* of Georges de Montemayor.—The tone of the narration and the pastoral romance;—the European vogue of the pastoral romance;—the *Arcadia* of Sannazar and of Sydney;—the descriptions of Forez in d'Urfé's romance [Cf. Montégut, *En Bourbonnais*, etc.];—the anecdotes of the court;—the symbolical intention [Cf. the dedication of the *Astrée*].—Connection between the *Introduction à la vie dévote* and the romance of the *Astrée*.

3. THE CHARACTER OF THE ASTRÉE.—General features of the work;—and that far from the episodes in it being hors-d'œuvre as compared with the main plot, as is the case in other romances of the same type, it is on the contrary the main plot that is the pretext or the opportunity for the episodes.—Varied interest of the book in consequence:—(1) Historical episodes [*Eudoxe et Valentinian*, part ii., book 12];—(2) Contemporary allusions [*Euric*, *Daphnide et Alcidon*, part iii.,

edifice. Since it is to be social, it will be general, which amounts to saying that it will not be, or that it will rarely be, the expression of the personality of the writer, but rather that of the relations of the individual with the requirements of an ideal humanity, always and everywhere analogous to or identical with itself, subsisting eternally, so to speak, and offering on that account immutable characteristics. Social in its aims and general in regard to its modes of expression, this literature will also be moral to the exact extent to which morality is indispensable to the existence of society. We would convey by this restriction that the literature we are about to deal with will be less concerned with embodying in its works the absolute side contained in the principle of every morality, than with rendering the relative element that is

book 3];—(3) Personal inventions [*Damon et Madonthc*, part ii., book 6].—The form of the narrative is no less varied:—descriptions [part ii., book 5];—conversations [part ii., book 12];—narrations [part iii., book 7];—examples of every kind of composition are found in the work, including letters and love sonnets;—to say nothing of passages of a more realistic or more brutal stamp.—Of the style of the *Astrée*:—its elegance and clearness;—it is smooth and flowing;—it combines precision with copiousness;—its psychological value;—and in this connection of the sketches of the different varieties of love in the *Astrée*.—Sensual and brutal love [*Eudoxe et Valentinian*, part ii., book 12];—fickle and capricious love [*Hylas*, part i., *passim*];—young and passionate love [*Chryséide et Arimant*, part iii., books 7 and 8];—chivalrous love [*Rosanire, Céléodante et Rosiléon*, part iv., book 10];—mystic love [*Céladon et Astrée*].—Variety of the characters.—That the book as a whole leaves an impression of charm and gracefulness to which there had been nothing analogous previously in French literature;—a fact that explains the success of the book, a success as prodigious as almost any in literary history: and the duration of its influence.

4. THE INFLUENCE OF THE ASTRÉE.—Ought it to be ascribed a share in the formation of "precious" society?—That in any case the work will shape the destiny of the drama for more than twenty years;—and

always to hand in its applications. In consequence, the morality in question will be neither the Christian morality of renunciation and sacrifice, nor even the Stoic morality of effort: it will be a morality for the use of good society. In the last place, this literature will not fail to attach great importance to the charms of style; first, because to persuade it will need to please; secondly, because style alone is able to save generalities from the danger they are always exposed to of degenerating into "commonplaces"; and thirdly, because it has already fashioned its rules of poetry and rhetoric on the Latin model. Let us now proceed to consider its performances and so follow its development.

of the romance for more than fifty years;—supposing that the *Princesse de Clèves* is, properly speaking, only an episode of the *Astrée.*—It is possible to go still further [Cf. Montégut, *En Bourbonnais*, etc.], and to trace something of the inspiration of the *Astrée*;—in Racine's tragedies;—in Marivaux' comedies;—in Prévost's novels;—in J. J. Rousseau;—and perhaps even among contemporary writers in certain of the novels of George Sand.—What precedes amounts to saying that the success of the *Astrée* determined the direction taken by an entire and important current in our literature.

5. THE WORKS.—We have already mentioned the *Epistres Morales*, 1598;—and *le Sireine*, 1606.—There must be added *Sylvanire*, a woodland fable, 1627, and the *Amours de Floridon.*

As to the *Astrée*, the two first volumes appeared in 1610 or perhaps in 1608; the two following volumes in 1616; and the fifth and sixth volumes in 1619. The four others are posthumous, and it is scarcely possible to distinguish between what of them should be attributed to d'Urfé and what of them is the work of Baro, his continuator. It is for this reason that we have not referred to them in our analysis of the romance.

The best edition of the *Astrée* is that of 1647, published by Toussaint Quinet and Antoine de Sommaville.

CHAPTER II

THE NATIONALIZATION OF FRENCH LITERATURE

I

I do not know whether war is "divine," but a state of conflict certainly seems "a law of the world"; no triumph is really peaceful, and even ideas rarely assert their empire except at the expense and on the ruins of other ideas whose place they take. Several con-

THE AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

FOURTH PERIOD

From the formation of the "precious" society to the first representation of the "Précieuses Ridicules"

1610–1659

I.—The Hotel Rambouillet.

1. The SOURCES.—The *Historiettes* of Tallemant des Réaux;—the letters of Balzac and Voiture;—Madeleine de Scudéry's *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus*;—Bodeau de Somaize, *Le Grand dictionnaire des Prétieuses*, 1661;—Fléchier's funeral orations in honour of the Duke and Duchess of Montausier.

Rœderer: *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie*, Paris, 1835;—Walckenaer, *Mémoires sur Mme de Sévigné*, vols. i. and ii., Paris, 1852;—V. Cousin, *La Société française au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1858;—A. Fabre, *La jeunesse de Fléchier*, Paris, 1882.

2. THE GENERAL THEORY OF PRECIOSITY.

A. *Of preciosity as a literary conception.*—It consists in believing (1) that there is something specific or unique in its class about the pleasure derived from literature as about that derived from music or ditions, in consequence, had still to obtain, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, to permit of French literature completely realising its true character; and first of all it was necessary that public opinion should master or stay the progress of that individualist, unruly, and licentious spirit, which had not been entirely subdued by Henri IV. even in the sphere of politics. A book which is at once one of the most enigmatical, and one of the foulest in our literature, Béroalde de Verville's *Moyen de Parvenir*, is contemporary with the *Astrée*, which itself is not exempt from a certain shamelessness of language and grossness of sentiment; while the obscene collection of the *Parnasse satyrique*, of which one scarcely

---

from the picturesque,—and this is the truth;—(2) that the essential cause of this pleasure is style, that is the turn the writer gives what he says, the manner in which he expresses himself,—which is already less true;—and (3) that the pleasure is in proportion to the effort that has been expended or to the difficulties that have been surmounted in hitting upon this mode of expression,—which is not true at all.—Analogies and differences between this conception and the conception of "art for art."—The principal of them is that preciosity aimed at the realisation of the "fashion" instead of at that of "beauty."—The resulting consequences are:—(1) A horror of pedantry, erudition and even of tradition;—(2) That in intellectual matters as in conversation and in clothes, store is only set on an air of modernity;—(3) A tendency, the outcome of this latter disposition, to exaggerate the distance that separates polite society from the vulgar herd.

B. *Of preciosity as a disease of language.*—That it consists in treating language no longer as a "work of art" even;—but as a pretext for the writer himself to make a display of virtuosity.

E del poeta fin la maraviglia
Chi non sa far stupir, vada alla striglia. [MARINO.]

[Cf. de Sanctis: *Storia della letteratura italiana*, vol. ii.; Menendez y Pelayo, *Historia de las ideas esteticas en España*, vol. ii.; and Mézières, *Prédécesseurs et contemporains de Shakespeare.*]—Some characteristics of the disease:—Never to call anything by its name, but always to have recourse to paraphrase, allusion or *sous-entendu*;

ventures to cite the title, would alone suffice to illustrate the state of morals towards 1610.

Further testimony is offered by the *Satires* of Mathurin Regnier. Often quoted, on account of some few happy lines,—which prior to those of Boileau became proverbs directly they were published,—little read, but only the more vaunted, the *Satires* of Regnier are as it were the protest of the Gallic genius against the new ideal. Instinctively hostile, not only to all restraint, but to every rule or every law, Regnier defends and upholds in his *Satires*, not dogmatically, but with that nonchalance which is "his greatest artifice" and his charm, the entire and absolute liberty of the individual. Each of us is very

—to lend an exaggerated and jesting importance to trifles and to treat matters of moment in a conversational tone;—to play upon words, to make *points*, *conceits*, *agudezas*,

> Ne dis plus qu'il est amarante
> Dis plutôt qu'il est de ma rente;

to draw unexpected comparisons;—to force metaphors [Cf. *Les Femmes savantes*]; in a word, to couch all one says in a language only comprehensible to the initiated;—and in this connection that slang and jargon are to some extent the same thing.

C. *Of preciosity as a turn or disposition of mind.*—It consists in a natural or acquired dislike for the commonplace;—danger of this dislike;—but, on the other hand, its advantages;—and that its counterpart is a taste for what is refined, delicate, subtle and complex.—The way in which this disposition of mind tends to make affairs of love and gallantry the constant preoccupation of those who possess it.—Great resulting advantage to: conversation,—polite manners;—and social relations in general.—Women make their entry into literature—and with them make their appearance the qualities more peculiar to women;—qualities of which neither Montaigne nor Rabelais had had an idea;—and as much may perhaps be said of some of the greatest of the ancient writers.

3. THE HOTEL RAMBOUILLET.

A. *Catherine de Vivonne, Marquise de Rambouillet* [1588, † 1665].—Her family;—and her father, although the Marquis de Pisani, must well as he is; has the right to remain as he is; and whoever would interfere with this right deserves the name of pedant. At any rate, I know of no idea on which he harps in his verses more often or more complaisantly than the idea that everything is relative; which clearly is another way of expressing what I have just said. Around him is a numerous school that thinks and feels as he does, that is not properly speaking a school, in the sense that it is not inspired by him or by anybody it is possible to call its chief, but a school that along with him represents this spirit or rather this instinct of resistance: vulgar Epicureans of the type of the Motins, the Sigognes and the

not be taken to have been an Italian nobleman;—her marriage with Charles d'Angennes, Marquis de Rambouillet.—Tallemant's portrait of her [*Historiettes*, Paulin Paris' edition, in 8vo, ii., 485];—Mlle de Scudery's portrait of her [*Le Grand Cyrus*, edition of 1654, vol. vii., 489];—Fléchier's portrait in his *Oraison funèbre*.—She hit upon the idea of genius of assembling in her "ruelle" or private circle noblemen and men of letters on a footing of temporary equality.—The part played by the *Salons* in the history of French literature.—That it is strange that it should still be at the expense of Mme de Rambouillet that jests are made—while Mme Geoffrin is spoken of with admiration.

B. *Vincent Voiture, the living incarnation of Preciosity* [Amiens, 1598; † 1648].—His *Poems*,—and that among them there are many that are very insipid;—but there are a few that are exquisite;—and very superior to many of those of Cl. Marot;—and that can be compared with the most vaunted poems of Voltaire [Cf. *Stances à Silvie*, —*Epître à Condé*;—*Impromptu pour Anne d'Autriche*].—His *Letters*;—and whether it be true, as Voltaire has declared, that they are the mere "triflings of a rope-dancer"?—Boileau's estimate was juster.—Voiture's love-letters have the obvious fault of being too witty;—but among his miscellaneous letters there are many that are quite admirable [Cf. Nos. 123, 109, 101, 63, 90 in Ubicini's edition];—and a few that are distinguished by real emotion.

C. *Julie d'Angennes, Duchesse de Montausier* [1607, † 1671].—That she contributed more than any one else to render the Hotel

Berthelots; irregulars and libertines, such as the Théophile against whom Father Garasse will write his *Doctrine curieuse des beaux esprits*; daring and cynical free-thinkers of the kind that will be found depicted by the dozen in the *Historiettes* of Tallemant des Réaux. It may be worth while to note in passing that writers of a similar stamp have been seen or will be seen to arise during all the "regencies" of our history: the regency of Catherine, the regency of Marie de Médicis, the regency of Anne of Austria, and the regency of Philippe d'Orléans.

To whom must be attributed the honour of having, to begin with, checked and interrupted, and finally of having

Rambouillet ridiculous;—and that at any rate all that we know of her from contemporary testimony shows her in a sufficiently disagreeable light.—She was spoiled by too much homage;—her suitors or her "dying admirers" gave too much encouragement to her pretensions to wit;—she seems to have been far vainer than her mother of her good birth and high rank;—and finally the length of time she made Montausier wait before she accorded him her hand has invested them both with a certain amount of ridicule. [Cf. for Montausier, *Montausier et son temps*, by Amédée Roux, Paris, 1860.]

4. THE INFLUENCE OF PRECIOSITY.

A. *On the Language*.—It refined, enriched, and elevated the language.—Preciosity cleared the language of a certain pedantic overgrowth which encumbered it even in Montaigne;—and also of a coarseness that disgraced it [Cf. Béroalde de Verville's *Moyen de parvenir* and Tallemant des Réaux' *Historiettes*].—It enriched the language:—by determining the exact meaning of words;—by adopting, inventing or creating new turns of speech;—and above all by inculcating "the force a word acquires when put in its right place."—Finally, preciosity elevated the language;—though it is true that in elevating it, it drew too deep a dividing line between the speech of the vulgar and that of polite society.

B. *On Manners*.—Rœderer's exaggeration on this head;—and V. Cousin guilty of the same fault;—in their studies of the polite society of the period.—A saying of Pascal as to the malignity and kindliness of people in general, "which is always the same";—still, the names stemmed this current? And shall we exclaim once more with Boileau:

> At last Malherbe came? . . .

Doubtless no, if four or five very beautiful *Odes* and some paraphrases of the Psalms are, after all, nothing more than rhetoric; and further, if Malherbe himself, while not making a display of licentiousness or incredulity, was utterly wanting nevertheless both as a writer and as a man in distinction and true intellectual nobility. To take another point, it is not easy to see how his influence should have made itself felt, since his finest poems, which during his lifetime were scattered

by which things are designated have great importance.—The way in which preciosity raised the tone of conversation;—and improved the position of women. [Cf. Huet, *Sur l'origine des Romans.*]—On the other hand, preciosity accustomed the French intellect to treat serious matters too frivolously;—and by binding it down to the observation of good society, kept it from a wider and more sincere observation of reality.

C. *On the direction taken by literature.*—By establishing the predominance of the manners of good society, preciosity completed the downfall of lyricism;—since people do not frequent society with a view to making a display of their inmost feelings;—and still less with the intention of contradicting those they meet;—indeed, it may perhaps be said that nothing is more obligatory in society than the avoidance of "originality;—and all these rules of society run exactly counter to lyricism or personal literature. Again, while preciosity furthered the development of the "universal branches" of literature—oratory and the drama,—its influence even in this direction was not without its drawbacks;—admitting that it was with a view to content the Précieuses that our drama, in a general way, has refrained from too spirited an imitation of reality;—has deserved to be styled "a conversation beneath a chandelier";—and that gallantry instead of passion has become its mainspring?—On the other hand, preciosity aided the development to a notable extent of letter writing;—of books of *Maxims* and *Characters*;—and of the psychological romance.

through and to some extent lost in the anthologies of the period, did not appear in collected form until 1630, two years after his death. Moreover, if we are to believe the memoirs of his faithful Racan, he was almost without ideas except on the subject of his art. These various considerations will lead us to seek elsewhere than in his influence the causes of a transformation, of which he experienced the consequences far more than he brought it about or even conceived it. The transformation which is effected in French literary history between 1610 and 1630,—let us say 1636, so as to reach the *Cid* at one step,—is the work of the Précieuses.

All that is remembered in general of the Précieuses is

II.—Irregulars and Libertines.

1. THE SOURCES.—Leonardi Lessii, *De providentia numinis et animi Immortalitate libri duo adversus atheos et politicos*, Antwerp, 1613;—Garasse, *La doctrine curieuse des Beaux Esprits de ce temps*, Paris, 1623;—Tallemant des Réaux, *Historiettes*, articles DES BARREAUX, LUILLIER, PRINCESSE PALATINE, etc.;—Bossuet, *Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague*;—Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, articles DES BARREAUX, HESNAULT, and *passim*;—the works of Théophile de Viau, Saint-Evremond, and La Motte le Vayer;—the *Caractères* of La Bruyère.

Sainte-Beuve's *Port-Royal*;—Victor Cousin, *Vanini, ses écrits, sa vie et sa mort*, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, December 1, 1843;—Ch. Bartholomess, *Giordano Bruno*, Paris, 1847;—F. Fiorentino, *Benardino Telesio, ossia studi storici sull' Idea della natura nel risorgimento*, Florence, 1874;—Alleaume's *Notice* preceding the works of Théophile, Paris, 1856;—T. Perrens, *Les Libertins au XVIIe siècle*, Paris, 1896;—Kathe Schermacher, *Théophile de Viau, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Paris, 1898.

2. OF THE LIBERTINES IN GENERAL.—Signification of this name in the seventeenth century;—and that it applies as much to "freedom of thinking" as to "license of morals." That from both a philosophical and a literary point of view the libertines are belated survivors of Montaigne's century;—and the "Bohemians" of their time;—but that this in no way prevents them professing very pronounced

the characteristics by which they lend themselves to ridicule, and it must be owned that they had many such, on which Molière's comedies and Boileau's satires will dispense us from dilating here. They might be reproached more especially with having again brought French literature under the influence of the Spanish and Italian schools,—the influence of Antonio Perez and the Chevalier Marin, of Guarini and Gongora,—always supposing, however, that it would have been possible for them to avoid this result, at a Court wholly Italian, and at a time when the influence of Spain was reappearing in France across a frontier open to its inroads at every point. Nevertheless, the Précieuses rendered us great

principles;—and that if they had lacked the formula for these principles it would have been supplied them by Lessius in his *de Providentia*, and by Garasse, *Doctrine curieuse des Beaux Esprits*.—That as disciples of Montaigne and even of Rabelais, they were naturally hostile to almost all the projects of the Précieuses;—which were directed indeed against the libertines.

3. **Théophile de Viau** [Clairac, 1590; † 1626, Paris].—His early education;—his relations with des Barreaux and Balzac;—his tragedy *Pyrame et Tisbé*, 1617;—and that it is a better work than the two lines which have immortalised it might seem to indicate:

> Ah! behold the dagger which with the blood of its owner
> Was stained in cowardly fashion; the traitor blushes at it!

There are lyric passages of singular vigour in this tragedy;—and parts of the dialogue are already almost in the style of Corneille.—Other works of his deserve to be remembered;—for their animation [The *Ode du Roi*, ed. Alleaume, i., 135];—for the keen feeling for nature they evince [The *Lettre à son frère* (in verse) ii. 178];—for a certain sensual or Epicurean grace [*La Solitude*, vol. i., 176].—It is a pity that his works are spoiled by lapses into the most offensive vulgarity.—See too his *Satires* [vol. ii., pp. 238 and 241].—Whether it was his *Satires* or his *Traité de l'Immortalité de l'âme* and his *Parnasse* that brought about his first banishment in 1619?—Henceforth the poet's life is entirely upset;—the publication of the book services, which cannot be forgotten, slighted, or overlooked without falsifying the history during twenty or thirty years of manners and literature. For instance, because they were women, and women of social standing, they rid literature of the pedantry which hampers the works of Ronsard and even of Montaigne. One would be tempted to say at times that Ronsard and Montaigne only wrote for scholars. Their injudicious, or rather their complacent display of erudition ; their perpetual allusions to an antiquity with whose scholiasts and grammarians we are not familiar as they were; their naïve, and sometimes indeed their rather suspicious, admiration for the "false beauties" of Cicero or Seneca; their

---

of Father Garasse, which was aimed against him, deals him the final blow;—he is put on his trial;—he is sentenced to perpetual banishment by a decree dated September 1, 1625.

4. **The New Tactics of the Libertines.**—From this moment the Libertines change their tactics.—They keep their opinions;—but henceforth they abstain from expressing them in public; or if they express them, they moderate and disguise them, as did Saint Evremond and La Mothe le Vayer.—Their convictions are not deep enough for them to endeavour to assure their triumph in opposition to public opinion;—and provided they are allowed to live as they think fit, they will not ask for more.—This attitude is the indirect cause of the discredit into which they fell;—and from which they will scarcely recover until half a century later with Bayle.

5. **The Works.**—Of Théophile we have: his *Poems* [*Odes*, *Stanzas*, *Elegies*, *Sonnets*, *Satires*];—a tragedy: *Pyrame et Tisbé*;—his *Letters*;—and the *Traité de l'Immortalité de l'Ame*, a paraphrase of *Phédon* in prose interspersed with verse. In addition, there are a few detached pieces relating to his trial. The best and most complete edition is that to which we have referred of M. Alleaume in the Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, Paris, 1896.

The best edition of Saint-Evremond is the Amsterdam edition, 1739, Cövens and Mortier, 7 vols. in 8vo; and of La Mothe le Vayer, the Dresden edition, 1749, published by Michel Groell, 7 vols. in 8vo, issued in fourteen volumes.

habit of never making an assertion without supporting it on the authority of an ancient writer; these various practices, while they may dazzle our ignorance for a time, end before very long in tiring us, in trying our patience, and, to be frank, in boring us. It is disagreeable to us that a poet should bind himself down to a perpetual commentary of Mark Antony Muret or of Peter Marcassus; and we do not wish to have to learn Latin as a preliminary to understanding a French book. Such, at any rate, was the feeling of the Précieuses, and their attitude explains how it was, that by merely playing their part and taking an interest in literature, they at once obliged the writer to shake off the dust of his library. They

III.—**Alexandre Hardy** [Paris, 1570; † 1631, Paris].

1. The Sources.—The brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*;—Ad. Ebert, *Entwickelungsgeschichte*, etc., already cited above, pp. 71 and 73;—Edelestand du Méril, *Evolution de la tragédie française*, etc.;—E. Lombard, *Étude sur Alexandre Hardy* in the *Zeitschrift für neufranzösiche Literatur*, vols. i. and ii., 1880–1881; —Eugène Rigal, *Alexandre Hardy et le théâtre français*, Paris, 1889.

2. The Second Period of French Drama.—Alexandre Hardy may be accounted one of the "irregular" or "belated" writers who continue the literary traditions of the preceding age.—The "strolling player" at the beginning of the seventeenth century [Cf. Scarron's *Roman comique*; S. Chappuzeau, *Le théâtre français*; and H. Chardon, *La Troupe du Roman comique*, Le Mans, 1876].—The state of the theatre towards 1610.—Material organisation, actors and spectators [Cf. especially Eugène Rigal, *loc. cit.* and his brochure: *Esquisse d'une histoire des Théâtres de Paris de 1548 à 1653*, Paris, 1887].—The incredible fertility of Alexandre Hardy.—Of the struggle for predominance between the different forms of drama as seen in the pieces of Alexandre Hardy.—The saying of Aristotle: *Τραγῳδία, πολλὰς μεταϐολὰς μεταϐαλοῦσα, ἐπεὶ αὐτῆς τὴν φύσιν ἔσχε, ἐπαύσατο.*—Pastorals, tragedies and tragi-comedies.—That in literary history as in nature, the competition is the keener in proportion as the species are more nearly related.—Growing confusion between the art of the drama and the art of romance;—and that the "father of the French drama"

compelled him to comply with some of the exigencies of their sex, and the result was that a literature, which before had been purely erudite, adopted forthwith the tone of polite society.

This change was consummated, almost simultaneously and again in consequence of the influence of the Précieuses, by literature acquiring an air, it had hitherto lacked, of decency and politeness. Besides claiming the liberty of indulging their humour without restraint, the libertines and irregulars of the regency had asserted no less stoutly their right to remain faithful to the worst traditions and habits of the Gallic genius. They wished to be coarse, cynical, and shameless to the top of their

entirely failed to make for clearness ;—if in all respects save one his tragedies are less modern than those of Robert Garnier.—Their utter lack of literary merit.—They bear about the same relation to classic tragedy as the melodramas of Guilbert de Pixérécourt will one day bear to the romantic drama of 1830.—That to see any interest in his plays they must be considered as " experimental " efforts to determine the laws or conditions of the drama of the future ;—and also as evidence of the recrudescence of Spanish and Italian influences.

That from this standpoint, Alexandre Hardy must be allowed the merit, and it is a real merit, of having transformed a college amusement into a public representation.—He also essayed to differentiate tragi-comedy from tragedy.—Digression in this connection : on what depends the difference between the two branches ?—It would seem to depend on the social status of the personages ;—on the nature of the *dénouement* ;—and of the reality of the personages taken from history.—Was Hardy alive to the importance of history in tragedy ?

3. THE WORKS.—We know of forty-one plays by Hardy. They include : an interminable tragi-comedy, *Théagène et Chariclée*, based upon the romance of Heliodorus, in eight " days " ;—eleven tragedies borrowed from antiquity, with among them a *Didon*, a *Mariamna* and an *Alexandre* ;—twelve tragi-comedies, on ancient and modern subjects, imitated from the Spanish or Italian, *Gésippe*, *Phraarte*, *Cornélie*, *La Force du sang*, *Félismène*, *La Belle Egyptienne* ;—and finally five *Pastorals* ; —and five mythological pieces, including an *Alceste* and an *Ariane*.

bent. There were to be no concessions to woman, whose mission, as in the case of Mme de Montaigne, was held to be limited to keeping house for her husband, to bearing him children, to perpetuating his race or—as happened to the Cassandre and the Marie of Ronsard, the Francine of Baïf, the Hippolyte of Desportes—to serving as an instrument of pleasure or a stepping-stone to literary fame. The Précieuses demanded that men should accord them the respect to which every woman, as a woman, is entitled in civilised society; and they gained their end. No doubt it would be easy to point to passages even in Balzac or Voiture of which the indecency, the naïve crudity and the bad taste are astonishing. Still, in a

The best and only modern edition of Alexandre Hardy's plays is M. Stengel's, 5 vols. in 18mo, Marburg, 1883, 1884, Elwert.

IV.—**François de Malherbe** [Caen, 1555; † 1628, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Racan, *Vie de Malherbe*, printed in most editions of Malherbe's works; Godeau, *Discours sur les œuvres de M. de Malherbe*, preceding the edition of 1666.—Malherbe's *Letters*.—Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, article MALHERBE;—Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau la poésie française*; *Causeries du Lundi*, vol. viii.; and *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. xiii.;—G. Allais, *Malherbe et la poésie française à la fin du XVI^e siècle*, Paris, 1891;—F. Brunot, *La doctrine de Malherbe*, Paris, 1891;—V. Bourienne, *Points obscurs et nouveaux de la vie de Malherbe*, Paris 1895;—Duc de Broglie, *Malherbe*, Paris, 1897.

2. THE MAN, THE POET, AND THE REFORMER.

A. *That Malherbe, in spite of the disdain with which he affected to regard his predecessors, did not differ from them to the extent that has been alleged.*—His general conception of poetry is that of Ronsard;—and the resemblance between them extends to matters of detail;—he makes "conceits" as Ronsard did;—like Ronsard, he draws upon mythology and to an abusive extent [Cf. *Stances à M. du Perier*; —*Ode à Marie de Médicis*;—*Stances sur le départ de Louis XIII.*];—and finally his sentiments, as were those of Ronsard, are often Pagan [Cf. *Consolation à Caritée*].—Of some anecdotes told of him, which support this latter assertion [Cf. Tallemant des Réaux, i., 287, 290, 284].

B. *That he lacks, or only possesses in an indifferent degree, the* general way, the influence of the Précieuses tended to purify, or if the expression be preferred, to polish literature and even manners. Neither Mme de Rambouillet, "the incomparable Arthénice," nor her daughter Julie d'Angennes, so patiently wooed by Montausier, nor the many gracious women whose training was effected by the conversations of the famous "blue chamber," permit the naked image to be thrust on them, in social converse or in books, of what each of us endeavours to hide in real, everyday life. There are acts that cannot be talked of, and not all that is talked of can be written about. For the future it is incumbent on men to have regard to social considerations, to the season or the circumstances, to age

qualities which make the poet, but he has the qualities of an excellent versifier.—It would be impossible to be more deficient than he is in enthusiasm;—the saying of Cavalier Marin.—His want of imagination.—Mythology, which with Ronsard is still instinct with life, becomes a mere "tool" with Malherbe;—and the metaphors he derives from it are not the expression of his emotion, but simply serve as ornaments to his theme.—His want of sensibility.—It is the life and still more the variety imparted by sensibility, when it is keen, that is lacking in his *Odes*.—Finally his want of naturalness.—On the other hand, he posesses the sense of logical development;—that of oratorical harmony;—a taste for work well done.—His theories as to the importance and the "richness" of rhyme:—his strict regard for grammar [Cf. Racan, *Vie de Malherbe*];—and that in view of this characteristic it is strange that the Banvilles and Gautiers of contemporary French poetry should not have recognised that he is their true ancestor.

C. *That while the very nature of the lessons inculcated by Malherbe explains their influence, he is none the greater as a writer on that account.*—His ideal, as was the case with that of Ronsard as he grew older, tended towards the entire elimination of the personal element from lyricism;—and in consequence to transform lyricism into oratorical verse [Cf. *Stances au roi Henri le Grand partant pour le Limousin*].—This transformation responded exactly to the taste of the time;—and it had been effected, moreover, by Bertaut and the Cardinal du Perron in some of their poems [Cf. the *Recueil* and to sex. As a consequence, the situation of women is at once improved to a notable extent. Henceforth they will have to be taken into account, their modesty will be respected, they will be treated as equals. And should any belated survivor of another century be incapable of this self-restraint, he may fall back upon the taverns, and rhyme his Bacchic verses and his coarse songs amid men companions at the *Pomme de Pin* or the *Mouton Blanc*.

The refinement of language accompanies the polishing of manners, and were I not afraid of seeming to play upon words, I should be disposed to say that "politeness" and "polish" are matters that go naturally together.

des plus beaux vers de ce temps, 1606] ;—Malherbe accomplished nothing else, but he did the work better. [Cf. the *Sonnet sur la Mort de son fils* ;—the *Ode sur l'attentat de 1605* ;—the *Ode à M. de Bellegarde.*]—That in consequence it should rather be said that he witnessed than that he realised the reform with which his name is connected ;—besides, the first collected edition of his poems, which had been scattered previously, did not appear until 1630 ;—that he does not appear to have left any disciples rightly so-called, if the only two that can be named are Maynard and Racan ;—and that the budding Academy criticised his masterpiece, the *Stances de 1605*, as severely as it did the *Cid* itself.

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Malherbe are composed : (1) of his *Poems*, in all 125 pieces, the first of which : *Les Larmes de saint Pierre*, appeared in 1587 ; and the last, *Les Vers funèbres sur la mort d'Henri le Grand*, and the *Invective contre le maréchal d'Ancre* :

> Va-t-en à la malheure, excrément de la terre,

not until the edition of 1630 ;—(2) of his *Commentaire sur Desportes*, which was not published until 1825 ;—(3) of his translations of the 23rd Book of Livy, 1621 ; of the *De beneficiis* ; and of Seneca's letters to Lucilius, 1637, 1638, 1639 ;—(4) of his *Correspondence*, of great interest for the history of Marie de Médicis' regency.

We may mention among the editions of Malherbe subsequent to the first, which was issued in 1630 by Charles Chappelain :—the

Refinement in words follows on that in habits, and the choice of ideas induces the choice of terms. In consequence, the triumph of preciosity was the starting point of a linguistic revolution; a result, indeed, to which all that was achieved by preciosity has been too often and wrongly restricted. Many historians of literature would confine the rôle of the Précieuses to having struck certain words out of the vocabulary, to having introduced others, and more especially to having replaced the habitual use of the proper, straightforward, and exact term by the employment of the metaphor. And I admit that they accomplished all this! But what is perhaps more interesting, and in any case more important, than to

edition of 1666, published by Thomas Joli, and containing the observations of Ménage;—the edition of 1757, published by Barbou, Paris;—Charpentier's edition, 1842, containing André Chénier's commentaries; and Lalanne's edition, Paris, 1862, Hachette.

V.—**Jean-Louis Guez de Balzac** [Angoulême, 1594; † 1654, Angoulême].

1. The Sources.—Ogier, *Apologie pour M. de Balzac*, 1627;—Goulu, *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste*, 1628;—Balzac himself "*pro domo suâ*" in his *Entretiens: Relation à Ménandre* (Maynard), and the *Passages défendus*;—Cassagne's preface to the great edition of Balzac's works, 1665;—Niceron, *Hommes illustres*, vol. xxiii.;—Bayle's *Dictionnaire*;—d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie*.

Rœderer, *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la société polie*;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, appendix to vol. ii., *Balzac le Grand Epistolier*;—F. Lotheisen, *Geschichte des französischen Literatur*, vol. i., pp. 165–201, Vienna, 1877.

2. Balzac's Influence.—Of the privilege of poetry, and that it is the sole explanation of the fact that Malherbe's reputation has outlasted that of Balzac.—Admiration of his contemporaries: testimony of Descartes [V. Cousin's edition, vol. vi., p. 189];—of Bossuet [*Sur le style et la lecture des ecrivains pour former un orateur*, in Floquet's *Études*, vol. ii.]; --of Boileau [*Réflexions sur Longin*, vol. vii.]—The influence of Balzac was far more considerable than that of Malherbe,

enumerate here the sundry words or locutions for whose introduction they were responsible, is to arrive at the reasons which determined the choice of these particular words and locutions. We referred to them above. There are acts which are ignoble in themselves, and of this nature are in general all of our acts that are to be traced to our animal origin: the words that serve to designate them share their ignominy and baseness, or it should rather be said, perhaps, that they heighten these characteristics, owing to the debasing intention that attaches to their use. There are other acts, walking or sitting down for example, that have no significance good or bad, and in consequence the terms that render them are equally

with which it was almost contemporary;—in a certain sense too it was happier, as it had not been forced to accomplish a work of destruction to enable it to exert itself.—At the same time it tended in the same direction;—and though they may mutually have spoken ill of one another, they nevertheless had the same disciples and the same admirers.

Of the principal qualities which his contemporaries admired in Balzac;—(1) *The purity of his elocution*;—definition of this word, and that it implies the choice, the appropriateness, and the charm of terms.—(2) *The harmony of his phraseology and sentences* [Cf. Cassagne's Preface and Godeau's *Discours sur Malherbe*].—*The boldness, appositeness, and abundance of his metaphors.*—Whether Balzac was in this respect an imitator of the Spaniards;—and in this connection of the influence of Antonio Perez [Cf. Philarète Chasles, *Études sur le XVI^{e} siècle*, and de Puibusque, *Histoire comparée des Littératures française et espagnole*].—A remark of Cassagne: "M. de Balzac," he says, "is always happy in the choice of his metaphors, *and having chosen them he does not fail to abide by them.*"—To these natural or acquired qualities must be added that of never neglecting to turn them to account [Cf. the letter to Costar on the subject of "the higher eloquence"].

That the principal defect which spoils Balzac's qualities is due less to their exaggeration than to his lack of ideas.—A just remark of Boileau,—to the effect that in giving his attention more particularly to letter writing, Balzac erred as to the suitability of the epistolary wanting in significance. On the other hand there are noble acts, such as that of self-sacrifice, or, without going so far, such as all acts which constitute a victory of the mind over the body, of the will over instinct, of civilisation over nature; and the nobility of these acts is communicated to the words, and so to speak to the very syllables that express them. There is therefore a standard by which even custom is judged, whatever may have been said to the contrary. Our character is revealed by our manners, which in turn are betokened by our words even more than by our actions; a race or a nation betrays itself by the character of the language it speaks; and finally a period

style to his talent.—This mistake is clearly seen when his *Treatises* or his *Dissertations* are compared with the *Letters* proper.—That even in these *Treatises* themselves he lacks experience to some extent of the matter he discusses;—his politics are essentially "bookish";—and his philosophy was forged entirely in his study.—Still, neither Pascal [Cf. *Le Prince*, p. 27, in the edition of 1665], nor Bossuet [Cf. *Socrate Chrétien*, pp. 239, 240], seems to have read him without profit.—But it was more particularly by Corneille that he was studied [Cf. the four *Dissertations politiques* addressed to Mme de Rambouillet, *sur les Romains* and *sur la gloire*].

In consequence, in spite of all his defects, he may be said to have done something more for the French genius than to "coach it in rhetoric," according to Sainte-Beuve's expression.—He was acquainted with the sources and, as the ancients said, with the "topics" of lofty eloquence;—on more than one occasion he displayed a sufficiently exact and practised critical sense [Cf. his estimates of Ronsard and Montaigne];—and finally he always strove after elevation.—That for all these reasons his personality is a considerable one in our literary history.—He has had many followers and many imitators;—the transformation of lyricism into oratorical prose was completed in his writings;—and his chief error, which he shared with all his contemporaries, merely consisted in his having believed that the object of art is to adorn nature with a view to making it more beautiful.—The means by which this end may be attained ought to be studied, but with the intention of having recourse to them as little as is characterised by the choice of its words and the turn of its phrases.

The merit of the Précieuses is to have been conscious of these truths. Their mode of expression was the exact counterpart of their manner of thinking; and they ought to be judged from the psychological rather than from the linguistic or philological point of view. Their efforts to refine or to reform the language were not, as was the case with the poets of the Pleiad, their principal concern, but were only a secondary undertaking entered on because they had perceived that the reform of literary habitudes could only be effected by the reform of the language. Doubtless while endeavouring to attain their end by all

---

possible;—and taking care to adapt them to the theme and to circumstances.

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Balzac are composed: (1) of 27 books of *Letters*, of which the earlier appeared in 1624, and the last after his death. Six books of these *Letters* are addressed to Chapelain and four to Conrart. All or almost all of them are of great interest for the literary history of the period.—(2) Of his *Entretiens* or *Dissertations*, of which there are 67, divided into: *Christian and Moral Dissertations*, 25;—*Political Dissertations*, 14;—*Critical Dissertations*, 28. [The *Relation à Ménandre* and *Les Passages défendus*, in which he defends himself against the attacks of Father Goulu, the author of the *Lettres de Phyllarque à Ariste*, form part of the *Christian Dissertations*. The three dissertations on the Romans form the first three *Political Dissertations*.]—In addition there are: (3) The *Treatises*, that is: *Le Prince*, 1631;—*Le Barbon*, 1648;—*Socrate Chrétien*, 1652;—and *Aristippe*, 1658. And in conclusion: (4) a series of letters in Latin.

The best editions of Balzac's works are:—the edition formed by combining the six volumes printed by the Elzeviers either at Leyden or at Amsterdam, and adding *Socrate Chrétien*;—and the standard edition of 1665, in 2 vols. in folio, Paris, published by Louis Billaine.

There are no modern editions, unless a "selection" of Balzac's writings, edited by M. Moreau, Paris, 1854, Lecoffre, be counted as such.

the means at their disposal, they did not resist the desire or the temptation to distinguish themselves from the crowd, to form coteries amongst themselves, and, as the saying is, to be "peculiar." However, if among the ways of being peculiar there be one that is assuredly excusable, and even in some respects legitimate, is it not that which consists in desiring to feel, think, and act more nobly, more delicately, and with more refinement than other people? To this ambition is to be ascribed the vogue of such very different productions as the trifling verse of Voiture, among which there is much that is charming; the Letters or the Treatises of Balzac; and the romances of Gomberville and Gombaud, *Endymion* and *Polexandre*

VI.—**Claude Favre de Vaugelas** [Meximieux (Ain), 1585; † 1650, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Niceron, *Hommes illustres*, vol. xix.;—Pellison et d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie française*;—Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, vol. i.;—Abbé Lambert, *Histoire littéraire du siècle de Louis XIV.*, vol. iii.

Moncourt, *De la méthode grammaticale de Vaugelas*, Paris, 1851;—Sayous, *Littérature française à l'étranger*, Paris and Geneva, 1853, vol. i., ch. 3 and 4;—Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. vi.;—Chassang, Notice preceding his edition of the *Remarques sur la langue française*, Paris and Versailles, 1880.

2. The Rôle of Vaugelas.—Vaugelas' birth and early surroundings;—and in this connection a few remarks on the subject of the Academy of Florimon.—Vaugelas' father: Antoine Favre;—his relation with François de Sales and Honoré d'Urfé.—Vaugelas, a tutor to the Carignan family.

Importance of his book *Remarques sur la langue française.*—By affirming that language is governed by usage, Vaugelas shielded the evolution of language from the caprices of individual taste;—by drawing a distinction between *good* and *bad* usage, he divided off the language of the "court" from that of the "street-porters of the *Port au foin*";—and by making the usage prevailing in the spoken language the standard of usage in the written language, he gave the classic language its essential character, which is that of being a for example. A further reason of this vogue is that while the great letter writer is at pains to hit on expressions and turns of phrase the grandiloquence of which shall be in keeping with what is termed around him the "*grand goût*" (or it may perhaps be translated the "best taste"), his fellow writers, the novelists, attempt psychological observation and analysis in their interminable narratives.

We are under yet another obligation to the Précieuses: the conversation cultivated in their *salons*, besides increasing the suppleness and fluency of the language, made for intellectual refinement. The evolution of the sentiments or the passions is studied with closer attention

spoken language.—Digression in this connection;—and that Bossuet, Molière, Saint-Simon, and how many others will write as "they will speak."—This being the case, the greater part of the blunders and licenses with which grammarians reproach them cease at once to be of any account;—this circumstance also explains the inner qualities of the classic language;—its vivacious clearness;—its briskness and naturalness.—The scruples of Vaugelas;—and that they concord with those of Balzac;—and with the teachings of Malherbe.—Bossuet's saying to the effect "that nothing eternal is entrusted to the keeping of languages that are always changing";—and, in this connection, of the comparison between a language and an organism.—That there is a distinction between "immobilising" a language (or shutting the door against all change) and "fixing" it (or giving it stability as far as essentials are concerned);—that Vaugelas' object was to "fix" the current usage;—and in what measure he was successful [Cf. Haase, Obert's trans., *Syntaxe du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1898].

Vaugelas at the Hôtel Rambouillet,—and at the French Academy. Rejoinders provoked by his *Remarques*.—La Mothe le Vayer's opuscule dealing with the *Remarques sur la langue française*.—P. Bouhours' estimate of Vaugelas [Cf. *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*].

3. THE WORKS.—*Remarques sur la langue française*, Paris, 1647, in 4to;—and *Quinte Curce: de la vie et des actions d'Alexandre le Grand*, translated by A. Favre de Vaugelas, Paris, 1653, in 4to.

We have referred above to the excellent modern edition of the *Remarques* edited by M. A. Chassang (1880).

till an inkling is obtained of a number of their finer shades, of which there is no indication that the "ancients" had any idea, nor even the writers of the preceding generation. Is it not essential that the notions conveyed by these nice distinctions should be analysed or, to use a better expression, be "dissected," if only with a view to an improved classification of the terms of politeness and good manners? What constitutes elevation? To decide the matter it must be carefully examined. The result is that, thanks to preciosity, appropriate expression and delicate analysis are introduced simultaneously into conversation. The interest of society in grammar and politeness has extended imperceptibly to psychology.

VII.—**Pierre Corneille** [Rouen, 1606; † 1685, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.[1]—*Bibliographie Cornélienne ou description raisonnée . . . des ouvrages relatifs à Corneille et à ses écrits*, by M. Emile Picot, Paris, 1876;—Fontenelle, *Vie de Corneille*, 1685, 1729, 1742;—Thomas Corneille, *Dictionnaire géographique*, article ROUEN; —Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xviii.;—F. Guizot, *Corneille et son temps*, 1st edition, 1813, last edition, 1852;—Taschereau, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Pierre Corneille*, 1829 and 1855;—Marty-Laveaux, Notice preceding his edition of Corneille's Works, Paris, 1862;—F. Bouquet, *Les Points obscurs de la vie de Corneille*, Paris, 1888.

Corneille: *Discours* and his "Examinations" of his own tragedies. —Granet, *Recueil de dissertations sur plusieurs tragédies de Corneille et de Racine*, Paris, 1740, Gisseq et Bordelet;—Voltaire, *Commentaire sur Corneille*, 1764.—Laharpe, *Cours de littérature*, 1799, 1805;—Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, 1809;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i., 1829; *Port-Royal*, vol. i., 1837; and *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. vii., 1864.—Desjardins, *Le grand Corneille historien*, Paris, 1861;—Levallois, *Corneille inconnu*, Paris, 1876.—J. Lemaître, *Corneille et Aristote*, Paris, 1882;—G. Lanson, *Corneille*, Paris, 1898.

---

[1] The enumeration of the sources, complete up to the date of issue of the work [1875], will be found in M. Emile Picot's *Bibliographie Cornélienne*. In the case of Corneille and in that of the great writers generally, we shall only mention the sources a knowledge of which appears to us indispensable.

The effort to express old ideas in a novel, original, and, on occasion, eccentric manner has led to the discovery of new ideas, the search for which will now become the general ambition and will soon be the chief concern of the makers of *Maxims*;—and in the end La Rochefoucauld, if he be given his proper place, will be merely the last of the illustrious Precieux.

We should add that this movement was the outcome of the efforts, made in common, not only of the men of letters, but also of the "*honnêtes gens*" or the members of good society; and it is doubtless due to this fact that "preciosity," speaking generally, did not meet with the same fate in France as in England, Spain, and Italy.

Frédéric Godefroy, *Lexique de la langue de Corneille*, Paris, 1862; Marty-Laveaux, *Lexique*, etc., Paris, 1868, forming the two last volumes of the edition of Corneille in the collection "Les Grands Ecrivains."

2. THE MAN AND THE POET.

A. *Corneille's emulators*;—and in this connection, that it is urgent to "disencumber" the history of literature;—and that only the name but not the work of Mairet, or even Rotrou, having survived, they are only worth attention in so far as they are a "function" of Corneille. —In what way and to what extent they paved the way for him. — Mairet's *Sophonisbe* and that Corneille was well acquainted with it, since he borrowed from it the imprecations he puts in the mouth of his Camille.—Predominance of the romantic element in Mairet's dramas.—The preface to *Silvanire*, 1625, and the rule of the three unities [Cf. Breitinger, *Les unités avant le Cid de Corneille*, Zurich, 1883].—General tendency of the writers of tragedy to treat subjects already dealt with.—The four *Sophonisbe* [Trissino, 1515; Mellin de Saint-Gelais, 1559; Claude Hermel, 1593; Moncrestien, 1596].—Backwardness of comedy in comparison with tragedy.—The *Galanteries du duc d'Ossone*.—The imitation of the Spanish drama in the dramas of Rotrou [Cf. Puibusque, *Histoire comparée des littératures française et espagnole*, Paris, 1842; and Jarry, *Essai sur les œuvres dramatiques de Rotrou*, Paris, 1858].—How the romantic element in Rotrou's dramas perpetually tends towards extravagance;—and the sentiment in them towards bombast.—The traces of Rotrou's influence

For why is it that Euphuism in England, Marinism in Italy, or Gongorism in Spain did not exert the same influence as was exercised among us by preciosity? The reason is that the purely literary side of the movement was overruled in France by its social side, the desire to be peculiar by the need that this peculiarity should find a host of admirers. Our Précieuses never forgot that the adversaries they had to combat in the first instance were the enemies of all order and discipline. In consequence, while in Spain or in Italy, Gongorism or Marinism led up to fresh excesses on the part of individualism, in France, on the contrary, it was the social ideal that came victorious out of the

in the history of French drama:—on Corneille, on Molière, on Racine.

B. *Corneille's early years.*—The false idea that is commonly entertained that Corneille was throughout an "heroic" writer;—and that on the contrary he began as a writer of comedy.—*Mélite*, 1629; *Clitandre*, 1632; *La Veuve*, 1633; *La Galerie du Palais*, 1633; *La Suivante*, 1634; *La Place Royale*, 1634; *L'Illusion comique*, 1636.—Literary interest of the comedies of Corneille's youth.—They owe nothing to the imitation of foreign writers;—they consist of incidents taken from ordinary life and but very slightly "romanced";—and their personages are already of almost middle-class rank.—The scenes of gallantry in Corneille's comedies;—and that the language in which they are written is a perfect imitation of that of the Précieuses;—and, in this connection, that there is a Louis XIII. style in literature as in architecture.—The "young girl" in Corneille's comedies;—the style of the comedies.—Singular character of the *Illusion comique*;—and why, towards 1635, there were so many comedies turning on actors and stage life.—*Médée*, Corneille's first tragedy.—What reasons induced Corneille to turn his attention to tragedy [Cf. Hatzfeld, *Les commencements de Corneille*, 1857;—P. Vavasseur, *Corneille poète comique*, 1864;—and F. Hémon, *Étude sur les comédies de Corneille* preceding his edition of the Works, 1886].

C. *The masterpieces.*—The *Cid*, 1637; *Horace*, 1640; *Cinna*, 1640; *Polyeucte*, 1642; *Pompée*, 1643; the *Menteur*, 1643; *La Suite du Menteur*, 1643; *Théodore*, 1645; *Rodogune*, 1646; *Héraclius*, 1647;

crisis in the end. It was the Précieuses who developed, strengthened, and consolidated that deep-lying tendency in French literature to give expression to "common" or general ideas rather than to particular opinions—a tendency already foreshadowed in certain of the writers of the preceding age. By their attitude, the Précieuses assured the vogue of those branches of literature which are termed "universal," and whose essential characteristic lies in the circumstance that their very existence depends upon the existence of a public to encourage them. Our meaning is that it is quite conceivable that a writer should compose an "elegy" or even

Andromède, 1650; *Don Sanche d'Aragon*, 1650; *Nicomède*, 1651; *Pertharite*, 1652.—Of some influences that have unquestionably left their mark on Corneille:—and, in this connection, of the allusions to current events in Corneille's dramas;—the *Cid* and the duelling question;—the influence of Balzac and of his *Entretiens sur les Romains* [Cf. his letter to Corneille on the subject of *Cinna*];—the plots against Richelieu and the tragedy of *Cinna*;—*Polyeucte* and Jansenism [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*].—Corneille's genius suffers when he deals with subjects of pure "invention."—The complicated plots of *Rodogune* and *Héraclius*.—But here again his intention is to vie with the romance writers of his time: La Calprenède and Scudéri.—The sketches of the manners of the time of the Fronde in Corneille's masterpieces.—He exaggerates what is already too "high flown" in his Roman and Spanish models.—He essays for an instant, in *Don Sanche* and *Nicomède*, a more sober form of comedy;—but he is quick to renounce this effort as is seen in his *Pertharite*;—in consequence of the failure of which he leaves off writing for the stage for seven years.

D. *The genius and the dramatic system of Corneille*;—and that his *Discours* and his *Examens* should only be consulted on this point with much precaution;—because they are scarcely and only indirectly dogmatic and explanatory, but rather apologetic and polemical;—the abbé d'Aubignac and his *Pratique du théâtre* [Cf. Arnaud, *Théories dramatiques au XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1888].—The characteristics of Corneille's imagination.—In the first place his imagination was *strong and daring*;—that is to say it was dis-a "satire" and keep it to himself, that he should write a novel and lock it up in his desk, that he should note down in secret the chronicles of his time; on the other hand it has never occurred to any one to prepare a "discourse" or to write a tragedy in five acts and in verse solely for his own personal satisfaction.

It is these various influences that paved the way for, determined, and gave final sanction to the success of the "great" Corneille. For nothing is less like the real Corneille than the easy-going man of genius whose heroic figure is placed before us in all our histories, the truth being that the poet followed the veering of opinion with

tinguished by a leaning, at once natural and the outcome of circumstances, towards the extraordinary and the improbable;—hence his theory that the subject of a fine tragedy ought to be improbable [See Marty-Laveaux' edition, i., 147];—hence his theory as to the use to be made of history in drama [Marty-Laveaux' edition, i., 15],—hence his theory of heroism:

> When fate allows us to pursue a career of honour,
> It affords us a glorious opportunity to display our fortitude.

—Hence, too, the epic character of the personages in his dramas [Cf. an admirable passage on this point in Heine's *La France*];—the comparative absence of analysis and psychology;—the subordination of the characters to the situations [Cf. Saint-Evremond's study of Racine's *Alexandre*].—Comparison in this connection between *Rodogune* and *Ruy Blas*, or between *Cinna* and *Hernani*.—That Corneille's taste for complications of plot grafted on these tendencies, would have landed him in melodrama.

But while his imagination was strong and daring, it was at the same time *noble and lofty*;—that is to say he prefers what is noble to what is base in the domain of the extraordinary and the romantic;—what elevates the soul to what demeans it;—and in general heroes to monsters.—Still it is not true as has been said [Cf. V. de Laprade, *Essais de critique idéaliste*] that his drama represents the triumph of duty over passion;—it represents the triumph of the will [Cf. J. Lemaître, *Corneille et Aristote*] over the obstacles that interfere with its development;—and hence, in his drama:—his liking for unrivalled acumen, and guided his supple talent in accordance with his observations. Quite rightly, he is given an important place, a place of honour, in the *Grand Dictionnaire des Prétieuses*, of Bodeau de Somaize, where he is termed "the greatest man who has ever written pieces for the playhouse." The appreciation is just; and the chief preoccupation of Corneille, both in the comedies of his youth, in *Mélite*, the *Veuve* or the *Galerie du Palais*, and in the masterpieces of his maturity, was to win the approbation of the Précieuses.

In his *Examen de Mélite*, he himself claims with pride that his earliest achievement was to establish the reign of

political tragedy, which is pre-eminently the field for the exercise of the will;—his contempt for the passions of love, which he regards as being too "encumbered with weakness";—the moral purpose or rather the apparent moral purpose;—hence, too, the highly-strung sentiments;—and hence, finally, the art with which he exhausts the subjects he treats [Cf. *Examen de Rodogune*, Marty-Laveaux' edition, iv., 421].—"The second act surpasses the first; the third is superior to the second; and the last act throws all the others into the shade."—He is the master of his subjects just as his heroes are the masters of their fate. [Compare the contrary state of things in the Romantic drama.]

It is a pity, after this, that his imagination should be *tortuous and quibbling*;—which amounts to saying that he partakes to some extent if not of the lawyer at any rate of the casuist.—The "cases of conscience" in Corneille's tragedies;—and that they constitute their greatness;—but they also give them a certain tortuousness.—Hence the actions in his drama which he terms "implex" [Cf. the character of Sabine in *Horace* and that of Sévère in *Polyeucte*];—analysis of *Héraclius*;—admissions of Corneille on this subject.—To complication of plot he adds complication of motives;—Schlegel's observations on this point [Cf. *Littérature dramatique*, Saussure's translation, ii., p. 41].—Corneille's Machiavellism,—and that it would be possible to extract as many immoral maxims from his work as from the *Prince*.

> All those State crimes committed to wear a crown,
> Heaven absolves us of them, when it gives us the crown.

decency and morality on a stage whose license previous to his time had kept women away from the theatre. We find then that if he borrows a subject from Spain,—since Spain is the fashion,—he imparts to his personages in the *Cid* the quality of humanity, in the *Menteur* the quality of polish, and in both the quality of generality that are the characteristics of the polite society around him, and as it were the signs by which its members recognise one another. Similarly, when in *Horace*, *Cinna*, or *Rodogune*, he mingles politics and gallantry, it must not be supposed that he is imitating Justinus, Seneca, or Livy: he is sketching from the life the

Corneille's pretensions to a knowledge of politics;—the remark of Condé, cited in this connection, after the representation of *Sertorius*: "When did Corneille learn the art of war?"—and of Grammont after that of *Othon*.

E. *The old age of Corneille.*—*Œdipe*, 1659; *Sertorius*, 1662;—*Sophonisbe*, 1663; *Othon*, 1664; *Agésilas*, 1666; *Attila*, 1667;—*Tite et Bérénice*, 1670; *Pulchérie*, 1672; *Surèna*, 1674;—Corneille as a delineator of history;—and of the falseness of the paradox of Desjardins in his *Grand Corneille historien*.—Local colour in the work of Corneille.—That the defects of his last plays proceed from the same causes as the qualities of his masterpieces.—That they are mere special pleadings written in support of a thesis.—The Machiavellism of the motives [Cf. *Pertharite*, vol. vi., p. 571;—*Othon*, vol. vi., p. 632;—*Attila*, vol. vii., pp. 107, 162].—That the author's nobleness and elevation degenerate in them:—into affectation [*Nicomède*, vol. vi., p. 531];—into bombast [*Don Sanche*, vol. vi., p. 458];—into inhumanity [*Attila*, vol. vii., p. 172];—and finally that the bent of his imagination takes the changed shape of a mania for unreasoned inventions, innovations, and complications.—It is for this reason that "he now loads his subjects with matter";—that after having banished love from his plays he reintroduces it in the guise of the most frigid gallantry [Cf. *Othon*, vol. vi., p. 587; *Attila*, vol. vii., p. 140, 141];—and that he puts history to a false use in tragedy.

F. *The language and style of Corneille.*—That the poet amid this shipwreck of the qualities of his prime retains one gift to the end—for nobody, perhaps, has ever written better in verse than Corneille.

manners and personages of his time. Who is the Précieuse of whom Somaize tells us that "not only was she much esteemed for her beauty, *but as well for the loftiness of her soul*, while her intelligence was not solely preoccupied with trifles, *but rose to the consideration of matters of the first importance*"? This Précieuse is familiar to us; and before being called Emilie in Corneille's *Cinna*, or Cléopâtre in his *Rodogune*, she had more than once in actual history been a source of uneasiness to the great Cardinal under her real name of the Duchesse de Chevreuse. Numerous are the parallels it would be possible to draw of a like nature. When Corneille compli-

—[Cf. the speech of Auguste in *Cinna* and the narrative passages of the *Menteur*.]—Qualities of his style;—and to appreciate them, a comparison between the style of *Polyeucte* and that of *Andromaque*;—or between the comic style of Corneille and that of Molière and of Regnard.—Appropriateness and vigour of his language.—Richness and harmony of his verse.—Amplitude and vigour of his periods.—In what sense Corneille remains natural and consistent with himself even when he is guilty of incoherence and preciosity.—Of certain points which Corneille has in common with the Romanticists;—and in consequence of the points in common between Romantic literature and the literature of the time of Louis XIII.

3. THE WORKS.—Apart from his tragedies and comedies, the only work of Corneille of any importance is his translation in verse of the *Imitatio Christi*.

We shall content ourselves with citing here among the editions of his works:—the edition of 1660 in 3 vols.;—that of 1664 in two folio volumes, which is the most monumental, but unfortunately it lacks the plays of his later years—the edition of 1738 with Jolly's commentaries;—the edition of 1738 which is the first that contains Voltaire's commentaries and Gravelot's illustrations;—finally, among modern editions, to say nothing of very many others, that of Marty-Laveaux in the collection of the *Grands Écrivains de la France*, Paris, 1862–1868, Hachette.

VIII.—The Foundation of the French Academy, 1635.

1. THE ORIGIN OF THE ACADEMY.—The Italian academies of the

cates, embroils, and entangles his plots to the utmost in his *Sertorius*, his *Othon*, his *Attila*, he does so less in response to his own inspiration than with a view to vying as a romantic writer with the Gombervilles, the La Calprenèdes, and the Scudéris!

And his genius is not diminished on this account! His superiority is unaffected by his compliances with the variations and exigencies of the taste of his time, since the numerous writers who surround him,—Mairet, Rotrou, du Ryer, Scudéri, La Calprenède,—though they follow the fashion as he did, produced nothing of the stamp of the *Cid*, of *Polyeucte*, of *Pompée*, or of *Héraclius*.

time of the Renaissance [Cf. Pellisson, *Histoire de l'Académie*];—the academy of the last of the Valois [Cf. on this head M. Edouard Fremy's book, Paris, n.d.];—the Florentine Academy.—A remark of the Abbé d'Olivet on Balzac: "Up to that time," he says, "men of letters had formed a republic of which the dignities were divided between a number of persons, but this republic suddenly became a monarchy to the throne of which Balzac was raised by an unanimous vote."—That Conrart's original scheme for the Academy [Cf. his *Mémoires*] was devised precisely with a view to introducing an ordered hierarchy into the world of letters.—This purpose coincided with the wishes of the Précieuses of the Hôtel Rambouillet;—with the general desire of men of letters;—and with the more far-reaching plans of Cardinal Richelieu.—The "Letters Patent of January 29, 1635." —Why did the Parliament refuse to ratify them for two years? —It may be that established bodies dislike to see other bodies organised around them.—But Richelieu effected his purpose in the end.—The first academicians.—[Cf. Pellisson and d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie française*, Livet's edition, Paris, 1858;—Paul Mesnard, *Histoire de l'Académie*, Paris, 1857;—The successive prefaces of the Dictionary of the Academy;—A. Bourgoin, *Valentin Conrart*, Paris, 1883;—and the Abbé A. Fabre, *Chapelain et nos deux premières Académies*, Paris, 1890.]

2. THE OBJECT OF THE ACADEMY.—That it did not differ in principle from that which had been projected by the Précieuses, Malherbe, Balzac, and Vaugelas:—it was proposed to raise the French language to the dignity of Latin and Greek;—and in consequence to the uni-

I merely contend that his greatness is not dependent on his isolation, and that though he towers above his rivals he is bound to them nevertheless by ties of relationship. But he belongs essentially to that Precious society, which recognised and applauded itself in his works, which will remain faithful to him to the end, and will defend him against young and audacious rivals; and the consequence is, that although the Précieuses may have had their faults and even have exposed themselves to ridicule, the drama of Corneille is lasting testimony to the nobility, loftiness, and generosity of their artistic ideal.

There is a man who made no mistake on this score.

versality they had formerly enjoyed.—Conformity of this very clearly defined intention with the intentions of Ronsard and the Pleiad.—Why was it that all the translators who enjoyed a reputation at the time were members of the Academy?—*Because the sole object of their translations was to spread and, as it were, to incorporate with the substance of the French genius an exhaustive knowledge of antiquity.*—The "belles infidèles" of Perrot d'Ablancourt.—Why all the grammarians?—*Because it lay with them to set forth and to catalogue the riches, the resources, and the "possibilities" of the language.*—And why all the critics?—*Because it was believed at the time that there exists a necessary relation between the perfection of literary works and the observance of the rules or laws that govern the branch of literature to which they belong.*—Chapelain's Prefaces. —Controversies as to "the excellence of the French language" [Cf. Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, vol. i.].—The early labours of the Academy;—services rendered in general by the French Academy;—and in what sense it may be said of the Academy that it really fixed the language.

3. The Immediate Influence of the Academy.—In the first place it substituted a central literary authority for the influence of dispersed coteries;—and in this way, it was due to the Academy, and in the works of its members, that individual efforts began to converge towards a common goal.—Advantages and disadvantages of this literary centralisation. The establishment of the Academy enforced the conviction that literary glory is an integral and necessary part of the greatness of a nation [Cf. Du Bellay, *Défense et Illustration*, etc.].—

I refer to Richelieu, whose perception of the truth is the secret motive of his attitude, now friendly, now hostile, towards Corneille. The moment the writer and the poet, instead of keeping to themselves, began to mix in society, and to submit, as an earnest of their intention to please, to the discipline society imposed on them, Richelieu conceived the idea of making this new-born docility serve his political designs. It seemed to him that it would surely be a master stroke to turn to account the power of the intelligence, to make it an instrument of his authority; or, to put the matter a little differently, to interest men of letters in the realisation of his ambitious plans without

In this way it raised the status of the man of letters;—in the State; —and in his own eyes.—Finally, when the Academy set itself the task of "fixing" the language, it seemed at first as if the effort were destined to be successful;—and in any case, by enforcing respect for the language, it paved the way for what foreigners themselves will speak of a hundred and fifty years later as the *universality* of French [Cf. Rivarot, *Discours sur l'universalité de la langue française*, in answer to the question raised by the Berlin Academy].

IX.—The Origin of Jansenism.

1. THE SOURCES.—Ranke, *Histoire de la Papauté aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*;—M. Philippson, *La Contre-Révolution religieuse au XVI^e siècle*, Paris and Brussels, 1884; — Dejob, *De l'influence du concile de Trente sur la littérature*, Paris, 1884.

Molina, *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis*, 1595;— Jansenius, *Augustinus, seu Sancti Augustini doctrina de naturæ humanæ sanitate, ægritudine et medicina*, 1640;—C. Mazzella, *De Gratia Christi*, Woodstock Marylandiæ, 1878.

Dom Clémencet, *Histoire générale de Port-Royal*, 10 vols. in 12mo, Amsterdam, 1756;—N. Rapin, *Histoire du Jansénisme depuis son origine jusqu'en*, 1644, edited (and arbitrarily mutilated) by the Abbé Domenech, Paris, 1861;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vols. i. and ii.; —the Abbé Fuzet (at present Bishop of Beauvais), *Les Jansénistes et leur dernier historien*, Paris, 1876.

2. THE FORMATION OF THE DOCTRINE.—The importance of Jansenism

acquainting them with the secret of his intentions; and he fancied he saw the means of effecting his purpose in the movement in progress around him. All the small literary coteries that had come into existence in imitation of the Hôtel Rambouillet,—of which in reality they were only the caricature,—were evidence of a desire to see reign, even in intellectual matters, a measure of order and discipline. There seemed to be a tendency, operating on different lines to those he was following, in favour of that unity or, to use a stronger expression, that homogeneousness which was the principal or the unique object of his home policy. Just as he wished to

---

in the history of religious ideas;—of French literature;—and of politics.—The still existing hostility against Jansenism of an entire party.

The movement of the Counter-Reformation [Cf. Ranke, *Histoire de la Papauté*];—Self-concentration of Catholicism;—the revival of religious fervour during the last years of the sixteenth century. —*Molinism* [which must not be confounded with *Molinosism*];—and how it seems to have accredited the idea that we are masters of our destiny.—Du Vergier de Hauranne, Abbé of Saint-Cyran [1581; † 1643] and Jansénius or Janssen [1585; † 1638] combat this "corruption" of Christianity.—Early writings of Saint-Cyran.—The *Question royale*, 1609;—*Apologie pour Henri . . . de la Rocheposay évêque de Poitiers*, 1615.—Meeting between Saint-Cyran and Arnauld d'Andilly, 1620;—their relations with the Fathers of the Oratory;—the *Réfutation de la Somme du Père Garasse*, 1626;—the publication of the *Petrus Aurelius*, 1631;—The Port-Royal des Champs is transferred to Paris, 1626;—Saint-Cyran, director of the Port-Royal;—his imprisonment in the Bastille, 1638;—Publication of the *Augustinus* in 1640.

Analysis of the *Augustinus*.—The five propositions [Cf. the Abbé Fuzet, *Les Jansénistes et leur dernier historien*; and with regard to the essence of the question of grace, C. Mazella, *De Gratia Christi prælectiones scholastico-dogmaticæ*].—That the points at issue in this controversy are:—free will;—the definition of human nature;—and, finally, the entire question of conduct.—Further, from the point of view of the history of literature, an acquaintance with the conmake the French monarchy the type in some sort of the modern State, a veritable whole, really living and really organised, so literature also seemed to be tending towards the same ideal of organisation and common life. In the same way, while the object of his foreign policy was to make France the regulator of European politics, the secret ambition of the grammarians and critics—of Vaugelas, for instance, or of Chapelain—was to insure the French language inheriting the proud position of the Latin and Greek languages. A mutual understanding should be easy; and it took shape after some tentative essays in the conception of the French Academy. The French

---

troversy is necessary to an understanding of the *Provinciales* and of the *Pensées*.

X.—**René Descartes** [la Haye (in Touraine), 1596; † 1650, Stockholm].

1. The Sources.—F. Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes*, vol. i., book iii., ch. 1, 2, 3, 4, Paris, 1872; — Fiorentino, *Bernardino Telesio*, Florence, 1874; — Ch. Renouvier, *Philosophie analytique de l'histoire*, v. iii., Bk. xi., ch. 1, 2, Paris, 1897.

A. Baillet, *La vie de Monsieur Descartes*, Paris, 1691.

J. Millet, *Histoire de Descartes avant 1637*, Paris, 1867;—Louis Liard, *Descartes*, Paris, 1882.—A. Fouillée, *Descartes*, in the series of *Grands Ecrivains Français*, Paris, 1893.

Bordas-Demoulin, *le Cartésianisme*, Paris, 1843;—V. Cousin, *Fragments philosophiques*, vols. iv. and v.: *Philosophie moderne*, Paris, 1845;—Francisque Bouillier, *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne*, Paris, 1854;—Ravaisson, *Rapport sur le prix Victor Cousin*, 1884;—G. Monchamp, *Histoire du cartésianisme en Belgique*, Brussels, 1886;—F. Brunetière, *Etudes critiques*, fourth series.

2. The Man, the Philosopher, and the Writer.—What was the conception of science and philosophy in vogue before Descartes?—and that to attribute him the honour of having overthrown the philosophy of Aristotle is to make an error of something like a hundred years.—The rôle of Italy in the formation of the idea of science.—Galileo [Cf.

Academy was created for no other purpose than to bind up the destinies of literature with those of France itself; and that it might not happen that a social force so considerable as was already that of the intelligence should entirely escape the action of the central authority.

It remained to be seen under what conditions the understanding would be completed. For on several occasions, and even on the morrow of the foundation of his Academy, Richelieu had been brought to perceive —by the incident of Corneille and the critics of the *Cid*, —that he would not govern men of letters as he did his "intendants." Men of letters are lacking at times in that *esprit de suite*, which the cardinal demanded from

Fiorentino *op. cit.*, and J. Bertrand, *Les fondateurs de l'astronomie moderne*, Paris, 1865].—A few words as to Bacon and as to the slightness of his influence [Cf. Liebig, *Bacon*, Paris, 1866; and Claude Bernard, *Introduction à la médecine expérimentale*, Paris, 1865].—Of the learned ignorance of Descartes;—and how much he was indebted to his predecessors.—That he had certainly read Charron's *Traité de la Sagesse*;—the *Doctrine curieuse* of Father Garasse;—and, on his own admission, the Letters of Balzac.—Whether, as Huyghens believed, he was "very jealous of the renown of Galileo."

Descartes' education;—his early studies at the College of La Flèche, 1604–1612;—his early career in Paris and his passion for gambling [Cf. Baillet, ch. 8];—his military career, 1617–1621;—he is present at the battle of Prague, 1620.—His journey to Italy and his pilgrimage to Notre-Dame-de-Lorette, 1624–1625;—his sojourn in Paris, 1625–1629;—where it is probable that he wrote his *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii*.—The mythological allusions and the preciosity of expression in the *Regulæ*:—one is reminded of the Latin style of Bacon.—That these details reveal a Descartes who is an entirely different man from the speculative genius of legend.—No philosopher has seen more of the world;—has obtained an acquaintance at first hand with more varied social conditions;—which he studied with the express intention of learning "to know the human race."—He drew from life and from the observation of mankind what Montaigne sought in the observation of himself and in books.—He decides to settle in Holland, and takes those he took under his protection; and though their obedience is quite capable of going to the length of servility, still it is always to a certain extent capricious and intermittent.

It is at this juncture that the historians of French literature place the influence of Descartes and of his *Discours de la méthode*, the date of publication of which is 1637. "The influence of Descartes," wrote Désiré Nisard, "was that of a man of genius who taught men their true nature, and together with the art of attaining to a knowledge and control of their intelligence, the art of employing it to the best purpose." In another passage he says: "This is the reason why

---

up his residence in Amsterdam, 1629.—His romance: *Hélène et Francine.*

Some peculiarities of Descartes' character,—and how is it his biographers have not given greater attention to them?—The wide scope of his interests.—What has become of his verses on the "Peace of Munster"?—and of the comedy "in prose interspersed with verse," of which mention is made in the list of his manuscripts?—His habitual state of uneasiness;—his absentmindedness;—his changes of residence;—his mysterious existence;—his "fads."—Some curious fragments of his *Journal;*—his hallucinations and his dreams;—the memorable night of November 10, 1619, when "it seemed to him that the spirit of truth descended into him from heaven and possessed him."—Nothing similar is found in the life of Corneille;—and still less in that of Malherbe.—That it is time that a place should be given these peculiarities in the historical character of Descartes;—and that they should be kept in view in passing judgment on his philosophy.

The publication of the *Essais de philosophie* [in 4to, Leyden, 1637] comprising: the *Discours sur la méthode*, the *Dioptrique*, the *Traité des météores* and the *Géométrie.*—His controversy with Voet [Cf. J. Bertrand, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1891].—He publishes his *Méditations métaphysiques*, 1641;—his *Principes de philosophie*, 1644.—"He takes a dislike to the function of author, that deprives him of all desire to publish anything" [Cf. Baillet, *Vie de Descartes*].—His taste for the study of natural history and physiology.—His last the writers who came *immediately after Descartes* . . . are almost all his disciples. They are his disciples by the doctrines they adopt wholly or in part, and by the systematic treatment they apply to every order of ideas, and every branch of literature." Nisard also says in praise of Descartes that "he reached perfection in the art of writing French"; and he adds that this perfection consisted "in the perfect conformity between the language of Descartes and the French genius." I am of opinion, however, that it would be impossible to be more utterly mistaken; and without referring to the "perfection of Descartes' style,"—of which I should be disposed to remark, to borrow a well-known

journey to France, 1648.—The disappointment he experiences in his country [Cf. his Letters at this date].—That, in any case, the troubles of the Fronde would have sufficed to drive him out of France.—He takes up his residence in Stockholm, October, 1649;—where he dies [February 11, 1650].

Whether Descartes' style deserves the praise that has been bestowed on it by some critics?—If his style be considered impartially, it seems that he wrote clearly;—and that he expresses well enough what he wishes to express;—but there is nothing very superior in his style to that of Arnauld in his *Fréquente communion*.—Its principal merit is that it is free from those "ornaments" and "embellishments" with which Voiture and Balzac "enriched" their style.—On the other hand, for his style to be perfectly "natural," it would have to be a reflection of his true character, which it is not;—it is only his reason that finds expression in his prose;—and yet imagination played a greater part in his life than in that of any other philosopher.

3. THE WORKS.—They consist of the *Essais de philosophie*, published in 1637;—of the *Méditations métaphysiques*, 1641;—of the *Réponses aux objections*, 1641–42;—of the *Lettre à Gisbert Voet*, 1643;—of the *Principes de philosophie*, 1644;—and of the posthumous works;—*Traité des passions*, 1650;—*Traité de l'homme*, 1662;—*Traité du fœtus*, 1662;—and *Traité du monde*.—To these works is to be added a voluminous *Correspondence*, published for the first time in 1657 by Clerselier.

saying, that it may be likened "to pure water, which has no special flavour,"—the influence of Descartes, as will be seen further on, was not exerted in the direction that is alleged, and still less at the precise moment at which it is said to have taken effect. The truth is, that the publication of the *Discours sur la méthode*, far from having been followed by any progress in the domain of reason or good sense, was merely followed chronologically by a resumption of the offensive on the part of foreign influences: of Spanish influence to start with, then of Italian influence, and before long of both influences combined. The explanation of this circumstance is easy. Richelieu's work has been interrupted by his

Add also the *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii* and the *Inquisitio veritatis per lumen naturæ*, 1701.

There are several editions of the works of Descartes:—(1) The Amsterdam edition, 8 vols. in 4to, 1670–1683 and 9 vols. in 18mo, 1692–1713;—(2) the Paris edition, 1724–1729, 13 vols. in 12mo;—and (3) Victor Cousin's edition, 11 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1824–1826, Levrault.

M. Foucher de Careil has published two volumes of a Supplement to the works of Descartes, Paris, 1859–1860, Durand.

XI.—Port-Royal and the Arnaulds.

1. THE SOURCES.—Add to the sources given in article IX.:—Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, article *Arnauld*;—*Histoire du Jansénisme*, 3 vols. in 12mo, Amsterdam, 1700 [by Dom Gerberon];—*Mémoires du P. Rapin* [a continuation of his *Histoire du Jansénisme*, covering the period 1644–1669] edited by M. Louis Aubineau, 3 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1865;—*Mémoires d'Arnauld d'Andilly*, edited by Petitot and by Michaud and Poujoulat;—P. Varin, *La vérite sur les Arnauld*, 2 vols., Paris, 1847;—P. Faugère, *Lettres de la mère Agnès Arnauld*, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1858.

2. THE ARNAULDS, and in particular **ANTOINE ARNAULD** [Paris, 1612; † 1694, Brussels].—A letter of Balzac on the subject of the Arnaulds: "The entire household argues, preaches, persuades . . . and one Arnauld is worth a dozen Epictetuses."—The history of the family.—Soldiers, civil servants, courtiers, priests and nuns.—Arnauld d'Andilly, the father of Pomponne, the Minister, and the

death before he has been able to complete it; the Fronde has broken out; and for eighteen years the sovereignty is wielded by a Spanish Queen and an Italian Minister: Anne of Austria and Mazarin.

It is customary to date the Spanish influence from the great success of the *Cid* and the *Menteur*; but if something more be in view than a mere exchange of subjects between the two literatures, this is placing the date too late or too early. It is too late, since long before Corneille the *Astrée*, as we have seen, was nothing more than an adaptation in the French spirit of Montemayor's *Diane*; since Hardy, Mairet, and Rotrou had done little else than imitate or translate

author of the *Mémoires* [1588; † 1674];—Angélique Arnauld, who reformed the Port-Royal [1591; † 1661];—Agnès Arnauld, the authoress of the *Lettres* [1593; † 1671];—Antoine Arnauld, who shared with Louis XIV. the honour of having been called the Great by his contemporaries.

The publication of his book *La Fréquente communion*, 1643.—History of the book [Cf. Rapin, *Mémoires*, i. 22, and Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. ii.].—Whether it be true, as Rapin asserts, that no better written work had previously appeared in French;—and does he not overlook the *Introduction à la vie dévote*?—In what respect the book was really an innovation;—because it brought theology properly so called within reach of the lay public.—As to the authority of laymen in the matter of religion.—The Prince of Condé [father of the Great Condé] refutes Arnauld's first book in his *Remarques chrétiennes et catholiques*, 1644;—another refutation by the learned Father Petau: *De la pénitence publique*, 1644.—The fortunes of Arnauld's book come to be bound up with those of the *Augustinus*, for which work Arnauld writes an apology in answer to the bull of Urban VIII.;—and in this way the Port-Royal becomes the fortress of Jansenism.—Arnauld's conflicts with the Sorbonne;—his condemnation;—appearance on the scene of Pascal.

Jansenism becomes a definitely organised party;—its numerous adherents;—the "Mothers of the Church": Mme de Guéménée, Mme du Plessis-Guénégand, Mme de Sablé, the Duchesse de Luynes, the Duchesse de Longueville;—and in this connection, of the

Cervantes, Lopez de Vega, and Rojas; since the Précieuses, as has been said, confined their efforts at first to acclimatising Gongorism in France. But it is too early if the object in view be to fix the moment when this Spanish influence became a real menace to the development of our national literature, as the Italian influence had been in the past. In point of fact it is scarcely prior to the period between 1645 and 1660 that our dramatic authors, Thomas Corneille, Quinault, or Scarron—to mention but those whose names are not entirely forgotten—wholly restrict their activity to imitating the Spanish drama, and that they arrive at last at such a pitch that they are even unable to write a play

imprudence of the abbé Fuzet's scoffs [Cf. *Les premiers Jansénistes*, p. 154 and following pages].—Growing progress of the party under the Fronde.—Alliance between Jansenism and Gallicanism.—A pronouncement of Ranke on the subject of Jansenism: "While the Jesuits were piling up erudition in enormous folios, or were losing themselves in the labyrinth of scholastic systems of morals and dogma, the Jansenists addressed themselves to the nation." [*Histoire de la Papauté*, French translation, vol. iii., p. 307].

3. THE WORKS.—Of Arnauld d'Andilly we have his *Mémoires*; a translation of the Confessions of St. Augustin; the *Vies des Pères du désert*, without counting other translations and a considerable number of shorter works of edification or controversy;—(2) Of Agnès Arnauld, the *Lettres* published or rather collected by M. Faugère;—(3) Of Antoine Arnauld, "the Doctor," one hundred and forty volumes of works, the list of which is to be found in the *Dictionnaire de Moréri*.

We are not aware that more than two or three have been reprinted; and the only work of his that is still read is his *Logique de Port-Royal* [written in collaboration with Nicole], 1662.

XII.—The Novel since The "Astree."

1. THE SOURCES.—Huet, *De l'origine des romans*, preceding Mme de Lafayette's *Zayde*, Paris, 1671;—Gordon de Percel [Lenglet-Dufresnoy], *De l'usage des romans*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1734;—G. Körting, *Geschichte des französischen Romans im XVII. Jahrhundert*, Oppeln and Leipsic, 1885–1887;—A. Lebreton *Le roman au XVII*e

on a subject of their own, without placing the scene of it in Lisbon or Salamanca. At this juncture, there becomes rampant in every branch of literature a sort of exaltation, a predilection for the high-flown that amounts to extravagance. The great Corneille in person persuades himself, and proclaims in his preface to *Héraclius*, "that the subject of a fine tragedy ought to be improbable." The Gascon Gautier de Costes de la Calprenède—his name deserves to be printed in full—and Scudéri, who is from Normandy, and who, moreover, in this matter only lends his name to his sister Madeleine, are writing their *Ibrahim* and their *Cassandre*, their *Cléopâtre* and their *Artamène*, genuine novels of adventure, which stir the

siècle, Paris, 1890;—P. Morillot, *Le roman en France depuis*, 1610; Paris, 1893.

V. Cousin, *La société française au XVII^e siècle*;—Rathery, *Mademoiselle de Scudéry*, Paris, 1873;—René Kerviler, *Marin Le Roy de Gomberville*, Paris, 1876.

2. THE EVOLUTION OF THE NOVEL.—That the influence of Descartes is no more to be discerned in the novel than in the drama;—and that it hindered the novelists and their readers from adopting the *Astrée* as their standard, as little as it had affected the literary career of Corneille.—Can it be said that there is such a thing as a Cartesian system of Æsthetics? [Cf. Emile Krantz, *l'Esthétique de Descartes*, Paris, 1882];—and, in any case, the reading of the *Grand Cyrus* or of *Faramond* would never lead one to suppose that such a system exists.—It is the influence of preciosity that continues to make itself felt in these works.

The idealist tendency of the novel in the seventeenth century;—and that parodies, such as that by Sorel in his *Francion*, only confirm its existence;—since it is only what is in fashion that is parodied.—The complicated plots of these works;—and, in this connection, as to the connection between Corneille's tragic drama and the novels of La Calprenède and Mlle de Scudéri.—In both cases history is put to the same use, and in both cases there is the same preoccupation with current events.—The novelists, however, ascribe to hazard what Corneille attributed to the action of the will.—The epical structure and the impersonal character of the novel in the seven-imaginations of all their contemporaries, while the Picaresque literature is giving birth, so to speak, to burlesque under the auspices of the Scarrons, the d'Assoucis, and the Saint-Amants. The Italian influence comes into play side by side with the Spanish. Robortelli or Castelvetro is cited in justification of criticisms on Corneille. The writers of epopees, rendered prudent for half a century by the failure of the *Franciade*, take courage again in consequence of Tasso and his *Gerusalemme*. Mazarin acclimatises the opera in France. La Fontaine, who is beginning his career, completes his literary education by the study of the *Decameron*; Molière produces the *Etourdi*; Boileau

teenth century.—Its "documentary" interest and its psychological value.

A. *Marin Le Roy de Gomberville*. [Chevreuse or Etampes, 1599, or 1600; † 1674, Paris].—His *Polexandre* [1629–1637].—In this novel the kind of interest found in the *Amadis* is combined with a geographical interest:—the adventure of Prince Zelmatide and the history of Mexico;—the story of Almanzaïre, Queen of Senegal;—the adventure of the Princess Perselide and the court of Morocco;—Analogy between the sort of interest offered by *Polexandre* and that of certain "exotic" novels of our own time.

B. *Gautier de Costes de la Calprenède* [Cahors, 1609 or 1610; † 1663, Andely-sur-Seine].—A few words as to La Calprenède's dramatic writings: his *Mithridate*, 1635; his *Essex*, 1639; his *Herménégilde*, 1643.—His effort to combine the sort of interest he sees is taken on the one hand in Corneille's and on the other in Du Ryer's translations.—The use to which history is put in La Calprenède's novels;—and the sub-titles that might be given them;—*Cléopâtre*, or the dissolution of the Roman Empire;—*Faramond*, or the foundation of the French monarchy.—The declarations of Mme de Sévigné on the subject of La Calprenède.—"The beauty of the sentiments, the violence of the passions, the magnitude of the events, and the miraculous efficacy of their redoubtable sword, all these features entrance me as they might a young girl" [letter of July 12, 1671]; and in a letter of July 15: "As to the sentiments . . . I confess that they please me and that their perfection is such as to satisfy my ideal of what the chides and exclaims in a tirade that will afterwards disappear from his first satire:

> Who can to-day, without just scorn,
> See Italy in France, and Rome in Paris!
> . . . I cannot without horror and without pain
> See the Tiber mingling its swollen waters with the Seine,
> And flooding Paris with its children, its mountebanks,
> Its language, its poisons, its crimes and its manners.

Where is a trace to be found in all this of the influence of Descartes and Cartesianism? No! it is entirely untrue that the publication of the *Discours de la méthode* was an epoch-making event in the history of our literature. The contemporaries of Descartes, while full of admiration for

sentiments of noble characters ought to be."—Whether, too, La Calprenède's style is as bad as Mme de Sévigné alleges it to be in the same passage.—That its qualities do not stand comparison with those of Corneille's style;—but that the defects of both styles are identical or at any rate kindred.—La Calprenède's abundant imagination.—The whole of his art consists in exciting "astonishment," which he does with success.—Distant but indisputable analogy between the novels of La Calprenède and those of Alexandre Dumas.

C. *Madeleine de Scudéri* [Le Havre, 1607; † 1701, Paris].—Whether her rôle does not consist in her having adapted preciosity to the requirements of the middle classes?—In any case, it is a fact that she vulgarised preciosity by superadding, in her *Artamène*, to the adventures in *Polexandre* and to the historical details in *Cléopâtre*:—(1) allusions to and portraits of the men and women of "precious" society [Cf. Cousin, *Société française au XVII^e^ siècle*];—(2) contemporary episodes; for example, the story of Scaurus and Lydiane (Scarron and Françoise d'Aubigné) in her *Clélie*; Hesiod's dream (a picture of the literature of the period); the description of the "country of the Tender Passion" (the "Pays de Tendre");—and (3) a politeness or a gallantry very superior to anything of the kind to be found in La Calprenède or de Gomberville.—Perspicacity of some of her analysis of character.—Mlle de Scudéri's novels are "psychological" novels.

The success of all these novels was considerable.—For example, there were four or five editions in less than twenty years of La him as a mathematician, almost ignored him as a philosopher. And if literature finally threw off the yoke of all the influences that seemed in league to prevent its becoming purely French, it owes its release to entirely different causes, of which the first and most important was the revival of the Christian idea under the guise of the Jansenist idea.

For whatever difference there may be—and such a difference doubtless exists—between the Christian and the Jansenist idea, it was not detected at the outset; and while to-day it is no longer allowable for us to confound the two ideas, it is a fact that they were confounded for a time. It never occurred to Jansenius,

Calprenède's *Cassandre*.—His *Cléopâtre* was printed by the Elzevirs, a circumstance that was in itself a first step towards fame [Cf. Balzac's letter to the Elzevirs reproduced in A. Willem's book, *Les Elzevier*, Brussels, 1880].—There are German and Italian translations of these novels;—English imitations;—and, if Pradon is to be believed, there was even a version in Arabic of the *Grand Cyrus* [*Remarques sur tous les ouvrages du sieur Despréaux*, The Hague, 1685].—The reasons of this success are to be sought for in the fact that the romantic tone of the works was in accordance with the spirit of the time;—these novels did as much as or more than more vaunted works to establish the supremacy of the French language and of French literature.

3. THE WORKS.—(1) Of Gomberville:—*Carithée*, 1621;—*Polexandre*, 1629–1637;—*Cythérée*, 1640 and following years [2nd edition of the earlier volumes in 1642];—*La Jeune Alcidiane*, 1651: "This is a Jansenist novel," wrote Tallemant, "for its heroes are preaching sermons and offering up prayers at every turn" [*Historiettes*, iv. 467].—There is also a collection of verses by Gomberville.

(2) Of La Calprenède:—*Cassandre*, 1642;—*Cléopâtre*, 1647;—*Faramond*, 1661, only the first three parts of which are by La Calprenède. The novel was finished by P. de Vaumorière, 1665. We have already mentioned that La Calprenède wrote several tragedies.

(3) Of Madeleine de Scudéri:—*Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa*, 1641;—*Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus*, 1649–1653;—*Clélie, histoire romaine*, 1654–1661.—There is no doubt as to the authorship of these three

Saint-Cyran, Saci, Arnauld and their followers that they were engaged on a different work from that of a Vincent de Paul, an Olier, a Bérulle, or a François de Sales; and it was not till later that their initial emulation in promoting the good of mankind was transformed into mutual hostility. If, moreover, as is proper in the history of ideas, we understand by Jansenism less a rigorously defined theological doctrine than a general manner of feeling and thinking, it will be found that Jansenism is not confined to the Port-Royal writers, but is also a characteristic of some of their most illustrious adversaries. The style that will most closely resemble that of Nicole, "a grave, serious, scrupulous style," will be the

novels, which, although they purport to be by Georges, are certainly the works of Madeleine.—It is less certain that she is also the authoress of *Almahide ou l'esclave reine*, 1660–1663 [which, moreover, is unfinished];—but she certainly wrote *Mathilde d'Aguilar*, 1667, a short novel which,—with those by Segrais, published under the title *Les divertissements de la princesse Aurelie*,[1]—forms the link between the long novels of this period and *Zayde* and the *Princesse de Clèves*.

Mlle A. Scudery has also left a work entitled *Conversations morales*, Paris, 1886;—and an interesting Correspondence.

XIII.—The Heroic Poem.

1. THE SOURCES.—The Prefaces to *Adone*, 1623;—*Alaric*, 1654;—*La Pucelle*, 1656;—*Saint Louys*, 1658;—Boileau, *Art poétique*, "chant" iii., 1674;—Voltaire, *Essai sur la poésie épique*, 1728.

J. Duchesne, *Histoire des poèmes épiques français du XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1870.

Théophile Gautier, article on *Scudéri* in his *Grotesques*.—Rathery, *Mlle de Scudéri* [Cf. above].

Chapelain, *Correspondance* published by M. Tamizey de Larroque in the collection: *Documents historiques*, 1880, 1883.—*Les douze derniers chants de la Pucelle*, with an introduction by M. René Kerviler, Orleans, 1882;—the abbé Fabre, *Les Ennemis de Chapelain*, Paris, 1888.

René Kerviler, *Jean Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin*,Paris, 1879.

---

[1] Racine borrowed the subject of *Bajazet* from one of these short novels.

style of Father Bourdaloue. And supposing Jansenism, after all, as was the case with Protestantism before it, to have done the Christian idea no other service than that of forcing it on the attention of polite society, the achievement would be sufficient for our purpose. We are not entitled to appeal from the decisions of Rome in a matter of faith, nor to reopen the quarrel, nor to allege that in default of Jansenism another cause would not have produced its effects; but we have the right to ascribe these effects to Jansenism if it were indeed responsible for them; and to affirm that in the history of our literature the victory of the Jansenist idea was the triumph of the Christian idea.

H. Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des anciens et des modernes*, Paris, 1856;—P. Delaporte, S.J., *Le Merveilleux dans la littérature française sous le règne de Louis XIV.*, Paris, 1891.

2. The Authors.—Of the natural relationship between the novel and the epopee;—and, in this connection, of the histories of Herodotus and of Homer's Odyssey.—The seventeenth century was well aware of this relationship [Cf. the preface to *Polexandre* and *Ibrahim*, and Boileau, *Réflexions sur Longin*].—On the other hand, the Heroic Poems of the period are not the outcome of a natural communication between the two branches;—all their authors did was to follow in the footsteps of Ronsard;—it was also their ambition to emulate the European success of Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*;—and, in this connection, of Tasso's influence on French literature.—Finally, it was the current opinion that the dignity of France demanded that the country should possess its Virgils and Homers.—The double error of classicism:—as to the necessary condition of the epopee;—and as to the efficacy of rules.—This double error is nowhere more apparent than in the history of such efforts as *Alaric* or *La Pucelle*.—Another kind of interest presented by these works, failures and unreadable though they be:—they raised the question of the utilisation in literature of themes drawn from Christianity; and in this way, as will be seen, they started the quarrel between the ancients and moderns.

A. *Georges de Scudéri* [Havre, 1601; † 1667, Paris].—The first line of his *Alaric*:

> I sing the conqueror of the earth's conquerors.

It is in view of these considerations that the appearance in 1643 of Arnauld's book *La Fréquente Communion* marks a date of importance. "No devotional book, it has been said, exerted a greater influence," was more read, more discussed, even by women, and for this reason, while the work did not take the direction of literary opinion out of the hands of the Précieuses, it contributed more than any other book to divert their attention from merely agreeable questions towards questions of a more serious character. It appeared, too, at precisely the right moment to bar the possible progress of Cartesianism by renewing the authority of "tradition" the strength of which might

—A mixture of history, fiction, and the marvellous;—the table of contents of the poem *Alaric*: list of the "descriptions" and list of the "comparisons."—The unfailing bad taste of Scudéri;—it reaches such a pitch that it almost renders him witty, by leaving the impression on the reader that he is parodying himself.

B. *Jean Chapelain* [Paris, 1595; † 1674, Paris].—It would be impossible to be less "Parisian" and less "Gallic" than Chapelain, though he was born in Paris, lived in Paris for eighty years, and died in Paris.—It is strange that anybody should have wished to revive his reputation [Cf. V. Cousin, *La Société française*, vol. ii., p. 158].—His admiration for the Chevalier Marin and his preface to *Adone*, 1623;—his translation of *Guzman d'Alfarache*, 1631;—his reputation as a critic;—and as a prose writer.—His rôle in the quarrel over the *Cid*:—and that *Les Sentiments de l'Académie sur le Cid* is in any case his best work.—The character of the man;—and that he was one of the most commonplace of individuals, and one of the most rancorous as well.

The theme of *La Pucelle*;—and whether it be true, as Cousin asserts, that a finer theme does not exist.—Patriotism and æsthetics ought not to be mixed up uselessly;—and that what Cousin admires in the "plan" of *La Pucelle* is precisely what constitutes its inferiority.—Logic and Poetry.—Chapelain's chief pretension:—he desired that his poem should be at once history, poetry, and a moral allegory [Cf. his preface].—"In order to consider action under its Universal aspect, in accordance with the precepts, and so as not to deprive it of the allegorical sense by which Poetry is made one of the in-have been singularly weakened had there been nothing to counterbalance the influence of the *Discours de la méthode.* Shall we add that the book was written in French? In 1643, however, this circumstance, whatever may have been said to the contrary, was only a novelty when taken in connection with the *Augustinus* of Jansénius; and unhappily, as Sainte-Beuve has remarked, the method adopted in the book was still wholly scholastic or theological. It was reserved for Pascal to have done with this method, and to bring into existence a prose that should be purely French, by ranging talent or genius on the side of Jansenism in his *Lettres provinciales.* [In

struments of architectonics, I have arranged my matter in such sort that . . . France represents the Soul of man, . . . King Charles the Will, . . . the Englishman and the Burgundian the transports of the irascible appetite, . . . Amaury and Agnès the concupiscent appetite, . . . Tanneguy the Understanding, . . . the Pucelle (Joan of Arc) Divine Grace," etc.—That preoccupations such as these might have cooled a more ardent imagination than Chapelain's.—Prosaic character of his verse [Cf. his *Père éternel*, ch. i.; his portrait of Agnès Sorel, ch. v.; the description of the burning of Joan of Arc, ch. xxiii.].

That it must be well understood that in spite of the legend—the publication of the *Pucelle* in no way diminished the reputation or the literary authority of Chapelain.—There were six editions of his *Pucelle* in less than two years.—The work was praised in high-flown terms by Godeau, Ménage, Gassendi, Huet, and Montausier [Cf. Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, vol. xvii., p. 378, etc.].—It is Chapelain who is chosen by Colbert in 1661 for a part that may be described as "superintendent of letters";—and the truth is that, until the time of Boileau, the only reproach made the *Pucelle* is that it is tedious; —a criticism of which *Polyeucte* had also been the object.

C. *Jean Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin* [Paris, 1595; † 1676, Paris]. He attempted every branch of literature:—the novel, in his *Ariane*, 1632; —comedy, in his *Visionnaires*, 1637;—tragedy, in his *Erigone*, 1638; —in his *Scipion*, 1639;—lyric poetry, in his *Office de la Vierge*, 1645; —epopee, in his *Clovis*, 1657.—Moreover the sole interest of *Clovis* lies in the preface to the edition of 1673, in which Desmarets, almost this work, and in it alone, are found united all the qualities to attain to which had been the incessant effort of the writers of the previous fifty years. For almost the first time, the *Provinciales* brought within reach of whoever could read those great problems, of which it really seemed as if the theologians had desired to deprive us of a knowledge or to hide from us the interest, by overloading them with the weight of their erudition and dialectics. Even that air of fashion, that ease and distinction of manner, that sprightly and graceful wit to which so much importance and so much mystery were attached by the Précieuses, peeped forth from

for the first time, sets forth clearly the theory of "the literary uses of Christianity."

There is no occasion to allude to the writers of epopee who were the rivals of Desmarets and Chapelain.—The *Saint-Louys* of Père Le Moyne has fallen into utter oblivion,—and this in spite of the efforts that have been made to resuscitate it.—The century was already too reasonable,—and above all too ordered for the writing of an epopee to have been possible at the period.—Nevertheless, from a feeling of national pride, Frenchmen will obstinately continue to produce epopees from generation to generation;—and while it is the habit to talk of the continuity of dramatic production;—that of pseudo-epic production will remain no less regular in France.

XIV.—Comedy from 1640 to 1658.

1. The Sources.—The brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, vols. vi., vii., and viii.;—Léris, *Dictionnaire des théâtres*;—de Puibusque, *Histoire comparée des littératures française et espagnole*, Paris, 1843;—L. de Viel-Castel, *Essai sur le théâtre espagnole* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1840, 1841, 1846;—V. Fournel, *Les contemporains de Molière*, Paris, 1863–1875.

Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, articles Scarron, vol. xvii., and Quinault, vol. xviii.;—Morillot, *Scarron, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1888;—G. Reynier, *Thomas Corneille*, Paris, 1892.

2. The Transition from Corneille to Molière.—Of the utility of statistics;—and that they prove better than anything else that the history of literature and literary history are two different matters.—

amid the theology of the *Lettres Provinciales.* The tone varied from letter to letter in accordance with the changing necessities of the controversy, and great as might be the gulf between direct and personal satire and the highest eloquence, the author bridged it with a successful mastery, of which it is no exaggeration to say that it enraptured the reader. No comedy that had ever been put on the stage had produced so delightful an impression. No more eloquent utterance had ever been made even from the pulpit. Moreover, if the necessity were felt of opposing to the corruption of manners, to the growing relaxation of the discipline formerly in force, not

During the twenty years, 1640–1660, there were played or printed more than *two hundred* tragedies, tragi-comedies, comedies or pastoral plays;—how many of them have survived?—or of how many of the authors are the names remembered?—It would seem, then, that between the *Menteur* and *Les Précieuses ridicules* there was nothing but . . . a void;—which accounts for the honour that is accorded the *Menteur* of having paved the way for the comedy of Molière.—What is to be thought of this allegation [Cf. *Les époques du théâtre français*].—That in reality something did take place between 1640 and 1660;—and that what it was may be gathered from the statistics themselves.

Tragedy continues to gain ground;—and of the two hundred plays referred to it claims scarcely less than a half;—among which are included *Horace*, *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, *Pompée*, *Rodogune*, *Héraclius*, to say nothing of *Théodore* or *Pertharite*;—and much below these, but still of a certain rank, the *Saint-Genest*, 1646; the *Wenceslas*, 1647; the *Cosroès*, 1649, of Rotrou;—the *Saül*, 1639, and the *Scévole*, 1646, of Du Ryer;—the *Mort de Sénèque*, 1644;—the *Mort de Crispe*, 1645; and the *Mort du Grand Osman*, 1647, of Tristan l'Hermite.—Tragi-comedy, on the other hand, with only fifty plays during the same period, loses ground;—while it is comedy that makes progress at its expense.—According to the exact figures given by the brothers Parfaict, from *thirty-nine* plays [1639–1646] tragi-comedy falls to *sixteen* [1646–1653] and then to *twelve* [1653–1660], while comedy advances from *eighteen* to *twenty-five* and from *twenty-five* to *twenty-eight.*—Conclusion: plays of a clearly defined order are ousting and will soon entirely supplant those of a hybrid or doubtful kind.

indeed a new morality, but rather a morality of which some even of those whose mission it was to teach it were oblivious, it was just this morality that was contained in the *Provinciales*. And finally and above all—I only speak from the point of view of literature—if the aspiration of the moment was to be natural, and the efforts in this direction had as yet been unavailing; if a mistake had been made hitherto as to the means by which this end was to be attained, the *Provinciales* were at once the signal and the model that had been awaited. "The first book of genius to appear in prose, Voltaire has said, was the collection of the *Lettres provinciales*"; and

But while the true nature of tragedy has been determined by the masterpieces of Corneille, comedy is hesitating between two or three directions;—writers have discovered the art of drawing tears;—they are still in search of that of provoking laughter.—*Thomas Corneille* [1625; † 1709] endeavours to solve the problem by putting on the stage romantic and complicated adventures;—*Philippe Quinault* [1635; † 1688] by combining a realism of detail that is suggestive of the humbleness of his birth;—with an insipid gallantry that gives a foretaste of his operas;—*Paul Scarron* [1610; † 1660] by what Molière will term his "buffoonery," that is by the most exaggerated caricature, when he does not have recourse to obscenity.—Moreover all three writers continue to go to Spain for their models.—*Dom Japhet d'Arménie*, 1652, is an adaptation of a comedy by Moreto.—*Les Rivales*, 1653, is merely a fresh version of Rotrou's *Pucelles*, which itself is said to have been borrowed from Lope de Vega;—*Le charme de la voix*, 1653, is an imitation of a comedy by Moreto.—It seems as if all these authors had "eyes that see not" and "ears that hear not"; and hence it is that, in a certain sense, all these dramas are merely of interest to the curious.

Still they accustom the public to distinguish between the elements of its pleasure, with a view to experiencing a pleasure that shall be keener and more complete;—and the fact is it is only Rabelais that makes us laugh and cry at the same time.—The public is about to set its face against the mixing up of the different branches of the drama;—an attitude that constitutes a first step towards naturalness.—The language also becomes more natural;—it grows more supple, more a little further on he makes "the fixing of the language" coincide with the issue of this work. This assertion is excellent as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Another and still more important period dates from the issue of the *Provinciales*—that of the determination of the characteristics of classic literature and of the classic ideal.

> The sun has arisen, let the stars retire!

Were it not that this line of Scudéri's is slightly ridiculous, this would be the appropriate time and place to cite it. The "naturalness" of the *Provinciales* made no im-

diversified;—the vocabulary of Thomas Corneille is copious; Quinault is fluent; Scarron is often spirited;—and, in this connection, a comparison between the comedy of *L'Ecolier de Salamanque* or of *Dom Japhet d'Arménie* and that of *Ruy Blas* or of *Tragaldabas*.—Finally even a taste for the burlesque necessitates a measure of observation; —since a caricature is only good when it offers a resemblance with what is caricatured.

3. THE WORKS:—of Scarron: *Jodelet ou le maître valet*, 1645;—*Les trois Dorothées*, 1646;—of Th. Corneille: *Les engagements du hasard*, 1647;—*Le Feint Astrologue*, 1648;—of Scarron: *L'Héritier ridicule*, 1649;—Th. Corneille: *Don Bertrand de Cigarral*, 1650; —*L'Amour à la mode*, 1651;—Scarron: *Dom Japhet d'Arménie*, 1653;—Th. Corneille: *Le Berger extravagant*, 1653;—*Le Charme de la voix*, 1653;—Quinault: *Les Rivales*, 1653;—Scarron: *L'Ecolier de Salamanque*, 1654:—Th. Corneille: *Les Illustres Ennemis*, 1654;—Quinault: *L'Amant indiscret*, 1654;—Scarron: *Le Gardien de soi-même*, 1655;—Th. Corneille: *Le Geôlier de soi-même*, 1655;—Quinault *La Comédie sans comédie*, 1655;—Scarron: *Le Marquis ridicule*, 1656.

The best edition of Scarron is that published by Welstein in seven volumes, Amsterdam, 1752;—of Thomas Corneille, that by David in five volumes, Paris, 1748;—and of Quinault, that by Duchesne in five volumes, Paris, 1778.

XV.—Burlesque.

It would be sufficient to mention burlesque and then to refer the reader to Boileau, were there not three remarks to be made with pression upon the men of the preceding generation, upon the aged Corneille, for example; and when the author of the *Cid*, after having stood aloof from the theatre for six years, resumes writing for the stage in 1659, it will be with his *Œdipe*, to be followed shortly afterwards by his *Sertorius* or his *Othon!* On the other hand, to all the young and ardent writers the *Lettres Provinciales* were a revelation.

Shall I say that Bossuet himself was, as it were, transformed by the work? The expression might seem somewhat strong; and yet, seeing that his eloquence never made greater progress than in passing from his first

---

respect to the origin of this branch of literature;—its true character;—and its consequences:

(1) It is of neither French nor Gallic origin;—and Saint-Amant, Scarron and d'Assouci in no wise continued the tradition of Rabelais.—It is in the main of Italian [Cf. Vianey, *Mathurin Regnier*, Paris, 1896];—and in part of Spanish origin [Cf. the entire series of the Picaresque Romances].

With regard to its true character, one is tempted to connect it with preciosity.—Voiture in his "petty" verse [Cf. *A une demoiselle qui avait les manches de sa chemise retroussées et sales*, and the verses *A Mlle de Bourbon qui avait pris médecine*], displayed a tendency towards burlesque;—while Saint-Amant and Scarron were members of "precious" society.—The Précieux aimed at being more refined than nature and truth;—the writers of burlesque at exaggerating nature and truth;—but both classes of writers belong to the school whose motto we quoted above:

> Chi non sa far stupir, vada alla striglia . . .

Their object is to excite admiration;—and the means all of them employ to this end is to excite astonishment.

Finally, an important consequence of burlesque was to break up the party of the libertines into two groups:—on the one side the Scarrons or the Saint-Amants, who will put up with anything provided they be free to follow their humour;—on the other those who care less for being at liberty to live as they choose, than for the right to think as they please.

manner to his second, between 1653 and 1658—from the *Sermon sur la bonté et la rigueur de Dieu* to the *Panégyrique de saint Paul*,—how can one refrain from noting that this progress coincides exactly with the moment at which the *Lettres Provinciales* were at the height of their vogue? It was the example of Pascal, too, that liberated the genius of Boileau, since, as we are aware, his first *Satires* were composed between 1658 and 1660, while, in addition, the admiration Boileau will entertain for the *Provinciales* throughout his life is no secret. The truth is, it is this book that will convert him in the end to Jansenism! In the meantime, however, it is also the *Provinciales* that

---

XVI.—**Blaise Pascal** [Clermont-Ferrand, 1623; † 1662 Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Mme Perier (Gilberte Pascal), *Vie de Pascal*, 1684;—Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, article PASCAL, 1696;—Condorcet, *Eloge de Pascal*, in his collected works, 1776;—Bossut, *Discours sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. Pascal*, 1779;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vols. ii. and iii.;—Victor Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal*, 1844;—Lélut, *l'Amulette de Pascal*, 1846;—Gazier, *Le Roman de Pascal*, in the *Revue politique et littéraire*, November 24, 1877;—J. Bertrand, *Blaise Pascal*, Paris, 1891;—Ch. Adam, *Pascal and Mlle de Roannez*, Dijon, 1891.

Bauny, *Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous états*, 1630;—Caramuel y Lobkowiez, *Theologia moralis ad clarissima principia reducta*, 1643;—Escobar, *Liber theologia moralis*, 1656, Paris, 42nd edition;—the Notices preceding most of the editions of the *Provinciales*;—*Réponses aux Lettres provinciales*, 1657, by Fathers Annat, Nouet and Brisacier, S.J.;—Daniel, S. J., *Entretiens de Cléandre et d'Eudoxe*, 1694;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. iii.

Garasse, *Doctrine curieuse des beaux esprits*, 1623;—Et. Périer, Preface (anonymous) to the first edition of the *Pensées*, 1670;—Voltaire, *Remarques sur les Pensées de M. Pascal*, 1728–1734;—Boullier, *Sentiments sur la critique des Pensées de Pascal*, 1741;—Condorcet's edition of the *Pensées*, 1776;—the Notices preceding the editions of the *Pensées* from that of Frantin, Dijon, 1835, to that of M. Guthlin, Paris, 1896;—A. Vinet, *Études sur Blaise Pascal*, open, or unseal, so to speak, the eyes of Molière. For the date of the *Etourdi* is 1653, and that of the *Dépit amoureux* 1655; but by what masterpiece in its class were these imbroglios in the Italian manner followed in their turn? It is clear that Molière, Boileau and Bossuet read the *Lettres provinciales*. But supposing we had no proof of this, there would remain the fact that the *Provinciales*, by completing the purification of the literary atmosphere of the time, and sweeping from it the last obscuring clouds, at any rate, by rendering them possible, paved the way for almost all the masterpieces that are about to succeed the work of Pascal. The *Provinciales* founded a

1833–1844 [collected in a single volume, 1848];—Victor Cousin, *Études sur Pascal*, Paris, 1842, 1844;—Saint-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. iii.;—abbé Maynard, *Pascal, sa vie, son caractère et ses écrits*, Paris, 1890; G. Dreydorst, *Pascal, sein Leben und scine Kämpfe*, Leipsic, 1870;—Gory, *Les Pensées de Pascal considérées comme apologie du christianisme*, Paris, 1883;—Edouard Droz, *Étude sur lc scepticisme de Pascal*, Paris, 1886;—Sully Prudhomme, *La philosophie de Pascal*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July, October, and November, 1890.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Diversity of the opinions that have been formed on Pascal.—Some [Voltaire and Condorcet] have regarded him as a mere "fanatic," or at least as a "sectary";—others have made him out to be a "mystic";—others [Sainte-Beuve] a semi-Romanticist, by fits and starts a believer and an unbeliever.—There have also been critics who have reproached him with "scepticism" [Cf. V. Cousin, *Études sur Pascal*; and in the contrary sense, Droz, *Étude sur le scepticisme de Pascal*, p. 18, etc.],—and, in this connection, of the numerous false ideas on literary questions put in circulation by V. Cousin.—That this diversity of interpretation is solely due:—to the mutilated state in which the *Pensées* have come down to us;—to the mistaken view according to which the *Pensées* are regarded as Pascal's "confession," whereas they are only the material for a work of Christian apologetics;—and to the insufficient attention that has been given to the fact that Pascal's life was broken up into several successive periods.

Pascal's birth.—His family;—his education;—precociousness of school of writers who were to take nature for their model, a school that is equidistant from the stiltedness of Balzac and the preciosity of Voiture, authors whose characteristics were determined in each case by the ambition to ornament, embellish, and disguise nature; and thus it came about, by one of those ironies frequent in history, that it was the man who of all our great writers was most hostile to nature,—and even to reason—owing to his uncompromising moral attitude, that it was nevertheless this man who had the chief hand in influencing Molière and Boileau, and I now add La Fontaine and Racine, in the direction of "the

---

his genius [Cf. J. Bertrand, *Pascal*]; his *Traité des sections coniques*, 1639;—his arithmetical machine, 1642;—his experiments on vacant space, 1646;—and that these efforts afford sufficient evidence of the great inventive talent, the possession of which has been foolishly denied him [Cf. a diatribe by Nodier in his *Questions de littérature légale*].—His conversion to Jansenism, 1646;—and his first serious illness [Cf. Mme Perier, *Vie de Pascal*];—first relations with the Port-Royal.—Pascal's experience of society, 1649–1653;—his relations with the Chevalier de Méré and the Duc de Roannez.—The alleged romance in the life of Pascal.—Was Pascal a "gambler" as Saint-Beuve has asserted;—"handsome, a physical sufferer, a mixture of languidness and ardour, impetuous and deliberate, proud and melancholy" as Cousin sketches him;—or, as another writer holds, had he an ambition to play a part in politics [Cf. Derome in his edition of the *Provinciales*].—That without these suppositions we can understand his having studied the theory of probabilities;—his having written the *Discours sur les passions de l'amour*, supposing it to be indeed his work;—and his being the author of the remarks which Nicole has collected under the title *Discours sur la condition des grands*.—Pascal's second conversion, 1654;—and that it is to be regarded as a passage from a religion allowing some freedom of observance to a stricter religion.—His visits to Port-Royal.—The influence his sister Jacqueline obtains over him [Cf. V. Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal*, and in particular the two letters of Sister Sainte-Euphémie (Jacqueline) to Mme Perier, p. 240, etc.].—Whether the *Entretien avec M. de Saci* is to be ascribed to this imitation of nature" and of respect for the "rights of reason."

It is impossible to imagine two geniuses more unlike than the genius of Molière and that of Racine, unless indeed it be yet more difficult to draw a parallel between the heedless Epicureanism of La Fontaine and the middle-class staidness of Boileau. And yet, in spite of their dissimilarity, these four great men not only knew and appreciated each other, but were united by a real affection; and the hostelry, whose name has not come down to us, where Ronsard and Du Bellay met on a day in the year 1548, is not more famous in literary history

period;—his invention of the dray;—of the wheel-barrow;—he hits on the idea of omnibuses.—Definite conversion and entry into Port-Royal, 1655.—The miracle of the Holy Thorn, March, 1656 [Cf. *Jacqueline Pascal*].—Whether it was not at this juncture that Pascal planned writing his *Pensées*, but was hindered from executing his design owing to circumstances inducing him to produce the *Provinciales?*—Advantages of this hypothesis.—It explains at once the growing boldness of the *Provinciales* from the *sixth* and *seventh* onwards;—and, in the later Letters, the close and too little heeded connection there is between the conclusion of the *Provinciales* and the general scheme of the *Pensées*.

The question of fact in the first three Letters,—and that it is of slight importance.—The way in which Pascal, by changing his tactics from the fourth letter onwards, raised the real question at issue, which concerned the essence of the matter in dispute,—and put it on its proper ground.—The point to be decided was whether the Jesuits or the Jansenists should direct opinion;—and, more generally, whether an almost "society" morality should triumph or an uncompromising morality [Cf., in the *Pensées*, the fragment entitled: *Comparaison des premiers chrétiens et de ceux d'aujourd'hui*].—It may be that Pascal, while he was right in attacking the excesses of Probabilism, made a mistake in scoffing at the same time at casuistics;—and that this mistake is of far graver import than the fact that he tampered with some few quotations.—For in the place of the few quotations of which the absolute exactitude is open to question, he could have found a score of others;—whereas, although he may have than that classic tavern of the "Mouton Blanc," at which foregathered Ariste and Gélaste, Acanthe and Polyphile. What was there in common between the four friends? Merely two or three ideas, and no more, but two or three ideas that were fruitful. All four of them believed that the essential principle of art consists in the imitation of nature, and, in this connection, I have been at pains to show, on more than one occasion, that what the four admired in the ancients was the fidelity with which they had imitated nature [Cf. *Evolution des genres*, vol. i., Paris, 1889]. It was not at all because they were the ancients that they

won over to his severity a few souls of exceptional purity, he ran the risk of offending others of less purity, but souls for all that [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, bk. iii., the chapter on the morality of the average man].—The *Provinciales*, from the fourth to the fifteenth inclusive, went near to ruining the moral credit of the Jesuits;—but they would have proved as well the destruction of a part of religion itself;—had not the scheme of the forthcoming *Pensées* come into sight in the three last Letters.

The first edition of the *Pensées*, 1670;—and the successive additions to the text:—in 1727 [letter of the bishop of Montpellier to the bishop of Soissons];—in 1728 [Père Desmolet's *Mémoires de littérature et d'histoire*],—in 1776 [Condorcet's edition],—in 1779 [Bossut's edition],—in 1841 [V. Cousin's observations],—in 1844 [Faugère's edition],—in 1879 [Molinier's edition].—Is it possible to determine the plan of the Apology projected by Pascal?—Efforts in this direction of Frantin, 1835;—Faugère, 1844;—Astié, 1856;—Rocher, 1873;—Molinier, 1879.—That they have all failed, as all similar attempts will fail, so far as arranging the fragments of the unfinished book in their proper place is concerned.—But it is possible to form a general idea of the projected work;—the spirit in which such an idea is to be conceived is given by the spirit of the *Augustinus* itself;—admitting Pascal's *Pensées* to be the fragments of a Jansenist work of apologetics.—To the *Augustinus* are to be added among the books read by Pascal: Montaigne's *Essais*; Charron's *Sagesse*; Du Vair's *Epictète* and *Sainte Philosophie*; Balzac's *Lettres* and *Traités*.—This list indicates as it were the worldly element [the element of a nature admired them, and they have said so clearly enough: "The ancients are the ancients and we are the men of the present day"; but they admired them "for having excelled in hitting off nature," doubtless because they were nearer to nature: *Novitas tum florida mundi*! They believed, in the second place, that to allow that the imitation of nature is the principle or the "beginning" of art, is to declare in plain language that it is not the object or the "end" of art, and they held that a writer fails to fulfil his mission or his function, if he does not "improve on nature," as Bossuet is about to put it: he did not say "embellish" nature! And they

---

to persuade society] he added to the arguments of the *Augustinus*.—His own more especially personal addition consisted in his desire to convert the "libertines,"—whom he had had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with and even of frequenting while he moved in society;—and in his conviction that, in connection with the miracle of the Holy Thorn, he had been the object of a special Divine intervention.—If, after this, we keep in view the succession of dates, that is: 1654, the *Entretien avec M. de Saci*;—1655, his entry into Port-Royal;—1656, the miracle of the Holy Thorn;—1657, the last *Provinciales*;—and 1658 or 1659, the sketch of the plan of his Apology as transmitted us by his nephew, Etienne Périer, we are in a position to picture Pascal's scheme very much as follows:

Everything within us and around us bears loud witness to our misery;—and whether it be in the feebleness of our frame,—or in the vices of the organisation of society,—or in the impotence of our reason;—we are confronted by nothing but motives for despair.—To what, then, is to be ascribed the protest that arises from the depths of this despair itself?—the fact that on this account, we form an exception in nature?—and the invincible confidence we have that a better destiny awaits us?—We shall obtain a solution of these problems if we accept the doctrine of original sin,—the obligation we are under to expiate it,—and the doctrine of the redemption,—three points of dogma which, it will be remarked, are the essence of Christianity.—It may be that we are averse to accepting these doctrines?—In that case let us reflect, that to believe in them is sufficient in itself to allow of us being as good men as human frailty believed, in the last place, that the surest means to achieve this purpose, or,—if I may be allowed this rather pedantic expression,—to evolve this "end" from this "principle" was to make form or style the perpetual object of their concern.

It is this community of ideas that is to be met with at every turn, in Boileau's satires as in Molière's comedies, in the prefaces of Racine as in the confessions of La Fontaine. And the aims of the four writers were novel in the extreme if they be considered merely in connection with the ideas of their contemporaries, but the novelty disappears if it be a fact that the goal they had set themselves

will permit;—that these dogmas, too, were foreshadowed by the Old Testament,—announced by the prophets,—confirmed by miracles;—and finally, that if our reason will not admit them, we can at any rate accept them by an effort of the will.

That there is not a single fragment of the *Pensées*, that does not tend to establish some one of the preceding propositions;—though to thoroughly realise this fact, it must be borne in mind that Pascal's apology, as he himself conceived it, was directed at once against the libertines;—the philosophers,—the Jesuits,—and the Jews.—Importance of this remark.—Of the present day value of the *Pensées* as a work of apologetics.—[Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, vol. iii. appendix, and A. Gory, *Les Pensées de Pascal considérées comme apologie du christianisme*, Paris, 1883].—Of certain fresh facts which need to be taken into account in modern apologetics;—and, in this connection, of the science of the comparative study of religions.—Of the remarkable confirmation of Pascal's apologetics afforded by the Pessimism of Schopenhauer;—and by the doctrine of evolution [Cf. Brunetière, *La moralité de la doctrine évolutive*, Paris, 1896].—That the moral value of Pascal's apology subsists in its entirety, so far as rational certitude is not the only mode or the only species of certitude;—as man is not born good;—and as nothing human is organised on purely human principles.

Of Pascal's style,—and that there is nothing in French superior to certain of the *Provinciales*;—unless it be certain fragments of the *Pensées*.—Whether his style lacks grace, or (so as to avoid seeming to play upon words) tenderness and sweetness?—But, in any case, his was that towards which literature had been tending for something like a hundred years. After a century of tentative efforts, during which French writers had addressed themselves in turn to the ancients, to the Italians, to the Spaniards, for means to achieve a purpose as to the nature of which they were a good deal in the dark, the goal was at last in sight, and to reach it all that had to be done was to cease imitating the Spaniards or Italians, and, following the example of the ancients, to stand face to face with nature. "The imitation of nature is the chief matter, an illustrious painter will declare at a later period, *and the only object of all*

style ranges from the most familiar simplicity to the loftiest eloquence. — "Pascal's rhetoric," — and that it does not consist in entirely dispensing with rhetoric;—but in making rhetorical expedients serve to their own destruction;—and in only having recourse to art to attain to a more faithful imitation of nature.—Of the sentiment of the mysterious in Pascal's prose;—of his way of intervening in person in the cause he is pleading;—of his profound sensibility;—and of the "poetic" qualities that result from the mingling of all these elements.—Of sundry other qualities of Pascal's style:—its sharpness and conciseness,—its copiousness,—and its "compactness."—Sainte-Beuve's remark: "Pascal, an admirable writer when he completes the expression of his thought, is a yet greater writer in his unfinished utterances."

3. **The Works.**—We shall only make a passing reference to Pascal's scientific works, of which we may cite the *Essais pour les coniques*, 1640;—*Avis à ceux qui verront la machine arithmétique*, 1645;—*Expériences touchant le vide*, 1647;—*Récit de la grande expérience de l'équilibre des liqueurs*, 1648;—*Traité du triangle arithmétique*, 1654;—and his writings relating to roulette, 1658 [Cf. A. Desboves, *Étude sur Pascal et les Géométres contemporains*, Paris, 1878].

The principal editions of the *Provinciales* and of the *Pensées* are:

Of the *Provinciales*;—the original editions, 1656–1657, the artificial selections of which differ from each other to a considerable extent;—the Latin translation issued by Nicole under the name of Wendrock, 1658;—the Cologne edition published by Nicolas Schouten in 1659;—

rules is to enable us to imitate nature the more easily" [Cf. a lecture by Oudry in Watelet's *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*, vol. i., Paris, 1760]. A final coincidence, of the kind which, because they cannot be foreseen, lend history its varying and ever novel attractiveness, was destined to prevent this principle being responsible for the abusive consequences it might otherwise have involved: Mazarin had just died; Anne of Austria was about to follow him into the tomb; and Louis XIV., by three or four master strokes, had inaugurated his personal government.

Maynard's edition, Paris, 1851, Firmin-Didot;—Derome's edition, Paris, 1880–1885, Garnier;—Molinier's edition, Paris, 1891, Lemerre; —Faugère's edition, Paris, 1886–1895, Hachette.

Of the *Pensées*:—the original edition, Paris, 1669–1670, of which at least five examples offering a certain dissimilarity are known;—Condorcet's edition, Paris, 1776;—Frantin's edition, Dijon, 1835, Lagier; —Faugère's edition, Paris, 1844, Andrieux;—Havet's edition, Paris, 1852, 1887, Dezobry and Delagrave;—Astié's edition, Lausanne, 1857, Bridel;—Rocher's edition, Tours, 1873, Mame;—Molinier's edition, Paris, 1879, Lemerre;—Guthlin's edition, Paris, 1896, Lethielleux;—Michaut's edition, Friburgi Helvetiorum, 1896;—and Brunschwieg's edition, Paris, 1897, Hachette.

None of these editions is an exact reproduction of that which preceded it, and there is not one of them that should not be consulted for special reasons: theological, critical, literary, or paleological.

With the *Pensées* are usually given some opuscules of which the most important are: *l'Entretien avec M. de Saci*;—*Trois discours sur la condition des grands*;—*De l'esprit géométrique*;—the *Préface du Traité du vide*;—and the *Lettres à Mlle de Roannez*.

II

At this period the great king was young, gallant, and addicted to ostentatious splendour; there was nothing formal, solemn, or pompous about his youthful court, which bore no resemblance whatever to the idea that is formed of it by the study of what it became in later years.

FIFTH PERIOD

From the first performance of the "Précieuse Ridicules" to the beginning of the quarrel between the ancients and moderns

1659-1687

I.—**François** [vi.], **Duc de la Rochefoucald** [Paris, 1613; † 1680, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—La Rochefoucauld himself in his *Mémoires* [Cf. *Mémoires du cardinal de Retz* and *Lettres de Mme de Sévigné*];—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits de femmes* [Mme de Longueville, Mme de Sablé, Mme de La Fayette, M. de la Rochefoucauld], 1840;—V. Cousin, *Madame de Sablé*, 1858;—Ed. de Barthélemy, *Les amis de Mme de Sablé*, Paris, 1865;—Gilbert's *Notice sur La Rochefoucauld* preceding his edition of the Works, Paris, 1858;—d'Haussonville, *Madame de La Fayette*, Paris, 1891;—J. Bourdeau, *La Rochefoucauld*, Paris, 1893.

A. Vinet, *Les Moralistes français au XVII^e^ siècle*: *La Rochefoucauld*, 1837;—Prévost-Paradol, *Études sur les Moralistes français*, 1865.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—His family and his entry into society;—where he reads novels aloud.—The "ladies' favourite": —he is indebted for his first successes to the Duchesse de Chevreuse; —he endangers his fortunes by his adventure with the Duchesse de Longueville;—he finds consolation for the shattering of his ambitions in his close friendship with the Marquise de Sablé;—and he spends the last years of his life, which was that of an Epicurean, at the side of the Comtesse de La Fayette.—To this amatory and society

In proof of this, it is only necessary to consult the eye-witnesses of the beginning of the reign: Mme de Motteville in her *Mémoires,* Mme de La Fayette in her *Histoire de Madame Henriette,* Montglat, Loret in his *Gazette,* Bussy in his *Histoire des Gaules,* and finally Molière, Molière himself, the adroit Molière, in his account of the Pleasures of the Enchanted Island (*Plaisirs de l'Ile enchantée*). After the rather melancholy and even surly restraint of the preceding reign, on the morrow of the futile

---

experience add that of politics;—or at least of intrigue;—and the qualities or the defects of a nobleman who is at the same time a man of letters, which are:—the superiority that accompanies good breeding and taste;—the constant fear of being duped;—independence of spirit;—and impertinence [Cf. Fénelon and Chateaubriand].

How the book of Maxims was written,—and that it is a quintessence of the "precious" spirit.—Mme de Sablé's dinners, her "soups" and her "preserves" [Cf. Cousin, *Mme de Sablé*, pp. 105, etc].—The way in which the *Maximes* were raved over in Mme de Sablé's *salon*.—This vogue was due, so far as the subject matter of the Maxims is concerned, to the same intellectual tendencies that prompted the psychological analysis in Mlle de Scudéri's novels;—and so far as their style is concerned, to the prevailing taste at the Hôtel de Rambouillet.—La Rochefoucauld's early writings: his *Portrait par lui-même*, 1659;—his *Mémoires*, 1662;—and, in this connection, of the state of mind of a man who publishes his memoirs during his lifetime.—The preparatory stages through which the *Maximes* passed.—They are communicated to the author's friends [Cf. Gilbert, in his edition, vol. i., pp. 372–398];—they are even made public without being actually published [Cf. Willems, *Étude sur la 1re édition des Maximes*, 1864].—Whether this manner of sounding opinion was as common as some have alleged?

Of the value of the *Maximes*, and that it has been strongly overrated.—Does La Rochefoucauld possess a system or merely a "doctrine"?—That if he possess one, it merely consists in blaming men in general for the defects of his own character.—The *Maximes* do no more than sum up his own experience of life;—and his experience is limited in three directions;—by his immense ignorance;—by the comparative narrowness of the circle in which he moved;—and by his indifference to momentous questions.—Some of his maxims are commonplace though disastrous troubles of the Fronde, the court, the sovereign, and his youthful following of brilliant men and women were bent on amusement, eager for pleasure and possessed by an almost frenzied desire to taste life to the full. In what Mme de Motteville described as the "enchanted" gardens of Versailles and Fontainebleau, a thousand intrigues began and ended, complicated and crossed each other, to the indignation of the cross-grained champions of virtue, of those whom

[Cf. Gilbert's edition, *Max.* 2, 31, 79, 132, 134, 174, etc.].—Repetitions in the *Maximes* [Cf. on the subject of love, 74, 76, 77, 136, or on the subject of fortune, 53, 57, 58, 60, 165, 470].—Absence of composition and order in the *Maximes*.—The style of the *Maximes* and its conformity of idea with the "precious" style [Cf. 4, 115, 175, 252, 355, etc.].—Whether this preciosity does not degenerate in places into nonsense [Cf. 69, 78, 97].—But there remain a few maxims that deserve their reputation:—for real ingeniousness [Cf. 165, 182, 218];—for vivacity [Cf. 19, 367, 370];—and above all for clearness.—That this last quality, which, up to then, had been extremely rare, doubtless assured the success of the book.

Did La Rochefoucauld collaborate with Mme de La Fayette?—The statement in *Segraisiana*: "Mme de La Fayette used to say of M. de La Rochefoucauld: 'I have to thank him for my wit, but it is I who regenerated his heart.'"—The earlier novels of Mme de La Fayette: *La Princesse de Montpensier*, 1660;—*Zayde*, 1670;—*La Princesse de Clèves*, 1672;—Mme de Scudéri's evidence on this point [Cf. *Correspondance de Bussy-Rabutin*, Lalanne's edition, iii. 340],—and confusion must be avoided between Mme de Scudéri, the wife of Georges, and Madeleine, her sister-in-law.—That after a thorough examination it is difficult to find any trace of the hand of La Rochefoucauld in the *Princesse de Clèves*;—that it is merely true that both the *Princesse de Clèves* and the *Maximes* are natural off-shoots of the "precious" spirit, though of a slightly different order;—and that there is no trace either in the one or in the other of "Cartesianism";—while it is easy to point to traces of "Jansenism" in them [Cf. the preface to the first edition].

Of La Rochefoucauld's place in the literature of his time;—and of the impropriety there would be in making him out "a great writer."—A "great writer" is always abundant and fertile, and above all offers

Molière attacked in *Tartuffe*, perhaps with the consent of the king and in any case greatly to his satisfaction. It seemed—says an historian, whose idea I should be loth to borrow without giving it in his own words—"it seemed as if pleasure were eager to encircle with its garlands and to deck with its flowers the throne whose possession it was jealously disputing with fame" [Cf. Walckenaër, *Mémoires sur Madame de Sévigné*, vol. ii., Paris, 1844]. The time passed in a perpetual succession of banquets, repasts,

greater variety than La Rochefoucauld did.—That on this account, and in every sense of the word, he may be called "a writer of rare talent":—rare by reason of his sterility;—rare by reason of his originality;—and finally, when he is at his best, rare by reason of his exquisite qualities.

3. THE WORKS.—*Portrait de M. la Rochefoucauld* in the *Portraits de Mlle de Montpensier*, 1659;—*Mémoires de M. D. L. R.*, Cologne, 1662, Vandyck;—*Réflexions ou sentences, et Maximes Morales*, The Hague, 1664, J. and D. Stencker, reprinted by M. Alphonse Pauly, Paris, 1883, D. Morgand.—Still the genuine "original" edition is that of 1665, Paris, Barbin.

La Rochefoucauld has also left some minor works or fragments which, according to their nature, are included in the editions either of the *Mémoires* or of the *Maximes*;—and about a hundred Letters.

The last edition of the *Maximes* that appeared under his own supervision was that of 1678, containing 541 maxims instead of 314;—the best edition of his works is that of MM. Gilbert and Gourdault, Paris, 1868–1883, Hachette.

II.—**Jean-Baptiste Poquelin de Molière** [Paris, 1621; † 1673, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES[1].—Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, article POQUELIN, 1695;—Grimarest, *La Vie de M. de Molière*, 1705;—Baillet, *Jugements des savants*, No. 1520, vol. v. in the edition of 1722:—the brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, vol. x. 1747;—J. Taschereau, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Molière*, 1825,—and the 5th edition, 1863;—Bazin, *Notes historiques sur la vie de Molière*, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1851;—Soulié, *Recherches*

---

[1] Consult M. Paul Lacroix, *Bibliographie Molièresque*. Paris, 1875, Auguste Fontaine.

promenades, carousals, water parties, "river baths," masquerades, concerts, comedies and ballets, whence arose and assumed definite shape, not without some prejudice to morality, a new politeness, less studied and freer than that of old, equally removed

> From the rigorous virtue of the remote ages

and from the ceremoniousness of preciosity, both of which it rendered ridiculous in a different way but to

sur Molière et sur sa famille, Paris, 1863;—Jal, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*, articles Béjart and Molière, 1864 and 2nd edition, Paris, 1872;—J. Loiseleur, *Les Points obscurs de la vie de Molière*, Paris, 1877;—L. Moland, *Molière, sa vie et ses ouvrages*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1885;—Henri Chardon, *Monsieur de Modène . . . et Madeleine Béjart*, Paris, 1886;—G. Larroumet, *La comédie de Molière, l'auteur et le milieu*, Paris, 1887;—Paul Mesnard's Notice forming volume x. of the Molière in the collection of the *Grands Ecrivains de France*, 1889;—G. Monval, *Le Moliériste*, ten volumes, 1879-1889. [The brochures dealing with Molière's stays in the various provincial towns he visited are too numerous for a list of them to be given here, but almost all of them are referred to in the last five works].

Vauvenargues, *Réflexions critiques sur quelques poètes*, 1746;—Diderot, *Entretiens sur le Fils naturel*, and *Essai sur la poésie dramatique*, 1758;—Rousseau, *Lettre sur les spectacles*, 1758;—Chamfort, *Éloge de Molière*, 1769;—N. Lemercier, *Cours analytique de littérature*, 1810-1816, vol. iv.;—Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, 1809-1814;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, 1835; *Port-Royal* [bk. iii., ch. 15 and 16]; and *Nouveaux Lundis*, 1864;—P. Stapfer, *La Petite Comédie de la critique littéraire*, Paris, 1866;—Louis Veuillot, *Molière et Bourdaloue*, Paris, 1863 and 1875; F. Brunetière, *La Philosophie de Molière* [*Etudes critiques*, vol. iv.] and *Les Epoques du théâtre français*,—Jules Lemaitre, *Impressions de théâtre*, 1886-1896.

F. Génin, *Lexique comparé de Molière*, Paris, 1845;—Paringault, *De la langue du droit dans le théâtre de Molière*, Paris, 1861;—Alexandre Dumas fils, preface to *Un père prodigue*, 1868;—Edmond Scherer, *Une hérésie littéraire*, 1886;—Ch. Livet, *Lexique comparé de la langue de Molière*, Paris, 1895-1897.

an equal extent. This new politeness speedily exerted its influence, at first on manners, which became at once more elegant and more natural; on the language, of which it completed the refinement; on the sentiments, which became more subtle and more complicated. The success of the *Misanthrope* in 1666, of *Andromaque* in 1667, of *Amphitryon* in 1668 was the outward evidence of its triumph. It spread throughout the capital, and before long even to the provinces; and still further afield, abroad,

V. Fournel, *Les Contemporains de Molière*, Paris, 1863–1875.

Samuel Chappuzeau, *Le Théâtre français*, with a preface and notes by G. Monval, Paris, 1876;—Eugène Despois, *Le Théâtre français sous Louis XIV.*, 4th edition, Paris, 1894.

2. THE MAN AND THE POET.

A. *His youth and his years of apprenticeship and travel* [Cf. Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister*].—Molière's family;—his father, Jean Poquelin, and his mother, Marie Cressé;—second marriage of Molière's father, 1633;—Molière's studies at Clermont College;—it is untrue that the Prince de Conti was among his comrades there;—on the other hand, he frequented the household of Luillier, of whom Chapelle was the natural son [Cf. Luillier's *Historiette* in Tallemant des Réaux, vol. iv., and the notes of Paulin Paris];—and that there he perhaps became acquainted with Gassendi;—who most certainly was not a Cartesian.—Did Molière, in a well-known passage of the *Misanthrope*,

La malpropre, sur soi de peu d'attraits chargée, &c.,

translate a not less well-known passage of Lucretius?—and that in any case others had imitated the passage before him;—among them Desmarets in his *Visionnaires* and Scarron in his *Japhet d'Arménie*.—The company frequented by Molière in his early years was not the best that was open to a young man of the middle class in 1640;—while the company he kept became still worse when he made the acquaintance of Béjarts [Cf. Jal in his *Dictionnaire*, and Henri Chardon, *Monsieur de Modène*, etc.]—He gives up his post of valet attached to the royal household and becomes an actor, 1643;—Founding of the Illustrious Theatre, 1643;—the enterprise is unsuccessful;—a second theatre started in the Croix Noire tennis-court has a still shorter existence;—Molière is imprisoned for debt, 1645.—

in the petty German courts and on the restored throne of the Stuarts, it became for the whole of Europe the example and lesson it was for France.

The truth is the change marked an epoch not only in the history of manners, but also in the fortunes of France. Amid all these innovations, amid the very pleasures in vogue, the action of the sovereign was making itself felt by the energy of his will, the fixity of his purpose, the ubiquity of his regard, and the might

Changes in the troupe and departure of Molière for the provinces, end of 1646 or beginning of 1647.

His tour through the provinces [Cf. Chardon, *La troupe du Roman comique dévoilée*, Paris, 1876].—He plays successively:—1647, at *Carcarsonne*, *Toulouse*, and *Albi*;—1648, at *Nantes*, and *Fontenay-le-Comte*;—at *Angoulême*?—at *Limoges*? [It will be remarked that Limoges is the only French town of which Molière specifically mentions a street in his plays];—1649, at *Toulouse* and *Narbonne*;—1650, at *Agen*;—and why this stay at Agen authorises the belief that prior to it Molière gave two or three representations at *Bordeaux* [Cf. *Etudes critiques*, v. i.];—1651, at *Pézenas* and *Carcarsonne*;—1652, at *Lyons*;—1653, at *Lyons*, *La Grange des Prés* [Cf. *Mémoires de Daniel de Cosnac*];—1654, at *Montpellier*, *Lyons* and *Vienne*?;—1655, at *Montpellier*, *Lyons*, and *Pézenas*;—1656, at *Pézenas*, *Narbonne*, and *Béziers*;—1657, at *Béziers*, *Nîmes*, *Lyons*, *Dijon*, and *Avignon*;—1658, at *Grenoble* and *Rouen*.—On October 24 of the same year, Molière plays for the first time in the presence of the king, "in the guard-room of the old Louvre," the pieces represented being *Nicomède* and the *Docteur amoureux*.

The advantages Molière derived from his years of travel.—In the first place, he learnt his profession in the course of his tours;—and, in this connection, that it is strange that it should have occurred to no student of Molière to draw up a list of the pieces in which he acted.—There would be several ways of setting about this task, for instance:—an effort might be made to ascertain what plays were successful in Paris between 1646 and 1658;—and to ascertain who were the authors with whom the Béjarts were personally acquainted [and at least three of them are known: Rotrou, Magnon, and Tristan l'Hermitte];—and, finally, his library might be searched [Cf. E. Soulié, *Recherches*] for plays, which he seems to have of his arm. He had done more than merely accept as the natural heir the authority which had been, as it were, stored up for him by Mazarin and Richelieu; he had taken it over with the intention of keeping it intact in his own hands. In the place of ministers there were to be more managing clerks! Counsellors were to give way to courtiers! He was to have no more equals, not even abroad, but instead, on the banks of the Thames or amid the sands of Branden-

imitated in his own pieces, but in which he does not appear to have acted in Paris [Cf. Desmaret's *Visionnaires*; Gilet de la Teyssonnerie's *Le Déniaisé*; Cyrano's *Le Pédant joué*].—Other advantages derived by Molière from his tours.—During the wars of the Fronde he saw the provinces *in naturalibus*;—and, in this connection, of the services rendered literature by revolutions.—As a "Bohemian" and an actor, he was well placed to observe the comic side of life from an independent standpoint;—and to gauge social inequalities;—the foolishness of the great;—the power of resistance or of inertia of prejudices.—Finally, as actor, author, and the manager of a company he learnt what responsibility meant;—a matter of which his friend La Fontaine, for example, will never have any conception;—while, if a certain bitterness resulted from these manifold experiences, it is to this bitterness that he owes the superiority of his genius.

B. *Molière's plays.*

That there are at least two reasons why the language in which they are written should be studied first of all;—the first is that Molière's language is almost the only point on which Molière is still taken to task at the present day;—and the second, that it is primarily as a writer that he contrasts with those who preceded him, Pascal excepted.—Alexandre Dumas is mistaken in thinking that Molière would be reproached with making an involved use of sentences beginning with the relative pronouns "qui" and "que." [Cf. preface to *Un père prodigue*].—On the contrary, he is blamed:—for not having an organic style [Scherer];—for mixing his metaphors [Scherer, Fénelon, La Bruyère];—for being "abominably" addicted to the use of "chevilles," that is, of expressions introduced solely with a view to filling up a line or to obtaining a rhyme [Scherer];—for being incorrect in his grammar [Vauvenargues, Bayle, La Bruyère].—It burg, mere "pensioners" and "clients." A bare five or six years sufficed to achieve these results. Under the influence of this sovereign action, the establishment of order was witnessed, peace was seen to reign in the provinces, justice to penetrate there, honesty to resume its sway in business transactions, commerce, industry and the arts attracted and transplanted into France from Flanders or Italy, to make a fresh and vigorous start. France speedily became the richest and most populous of

---

may be rejoined: that many of his grammatical blunders are not blunders at all, as is the case with those with which Voltaire finds fault in Corneille [Cf. his *Commentaire*] or Condorcet in Pascal [Cf. *Éloge de Pascal*];—that it is true that "chevilles" abound in his verses, because he writes too rapidly;—on the other hand, strict adherence to metaphors is a characteristic of that "preciosity" of which he openly declared himself the enemy [Cf. the metaphors of Saint-Simon or Montaigne];—while, to conclude, the "organic style" is not proper to comedy.—Again, it was impossible that Arnolphe should employ the same language as Agnès, Agnès as Armande, Armande as Angélique;—the fact is, Molière's style adapts itself to the character of his personages;—it is a dramatic and a comic style;—or, in other words, it is primarily expressive of the truth of the characters.—Had Molière written like Terence, he would only have been half himself.—Further, for reasons of temperament;—of extraction;—and of personal experience of life, Molière's style is:—middle-class, which distinguishes it from Racine's style;—"affluent," to use Saint-Beuve's expression, which distinguishes it from Regnard's style [Cf. J. J. Weiss, *Eloge de Regnard*];—it is "life-like," which distinguishes it from Boileau's style, which, though it issues from the same source, remains "bookish";—finally, and since it is throughout prosaic, a feature that distinguishes it from La Fontaine's style, Molière's style is eminently realistic or "naturalistic."

The naturalism of Molière; and how it shows itself in the first place in his attitude;—if his two first plays be excepted;—and it be studied in *Les Précieuses ridicules*, 1659; *Sganarelle*, 1660; *L'Ecole des maris*, 1661; *L'Ecole des femmes*, 1662; *Critique de l'école des femmes*, 1663; *Impromptu de Versailles*, 1663; and the *Tartuffe of* 1664.—"Précieux" and pedants;—nobles and commoners;—actors and authors;—courtiers and ecclesiastics;—prudes and grotesque all the European states, and when, after a campaign of a few months, the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle consummated what had been accomplished in the Pyrenees and in Westphalia, there was at once no more brilliant Court than that of Louis XIV., and no sovereign better obeyed by his subjects, or more admired, more feared and more envied by his rivals than this monarch of twenty-nine! It is not surprising, under these conditions, that the "men of letters" should have admired him with the rest

characters,—all those whom he attacks in these works are those who disfigure and tamper with nature;—are those who interpose pedantic rules or respect for prejudices between art and the representation of life;—and are more especially those who claim to put nature under restraint or to discipline it.—Nature cannot be transformed;—and the vanity of the efforts that are made to transform it is the source whence Molière draws his comic effects.—This consideration, too, accounts for his showing himself independent of rules;—and of foreign writers;—an end to plays of the stamp of *Bertrand de Cigarral* or *dom Japhet d'Arménie*!—It is for the same reason that Molière attacks Corneille and the "great comedians," those of the Hôtel de Bourgogne;—since they do not work from the living model;—but set themselves an ideal of which we cannot verify the excellence by comparing it with nature.

That this naturalism is also met with in Molière's philosophy;—for there is a connection between these principles and those of the "libertines";—and those of Montaigne and Rabelais [Cf. above, pp. 59 and 88].—In his earlier plays and down to *Tartuffe*, Molière does not appear to doubt for an instant of the goodness of nature;—and, in any case, he prefers leaving nature to itself to endeavouring to make it "unnatural."—The signification of *Tartuffe*,—[Cf. Stendhal, *Racine et Shakespeare*; Louis Veuillot, *Molière et Bourdaloue*; abbé Davin, *Les sources de Tartuffe*, in the newspaper *Le Monde*, August 2, 13, 15, 22, 27 and September 3, 15, 19, 1873; Louis Lacour, *Le Tartuffe par ordre de Louis XIV.*, 1877];—and that to understand the indignation the play aroused, attention must be directed more particularly to the character of Orgon.—Both Jansenists and Jesuits are taken to task in the play;—while it is beyond question that religion is attacked in it, so far as religion be conceived as a "restraining principle."—Of the reasons Molière had to believe that he was of their contemporaries, and that like them, they should have resolved of a common accord to lend him obedience, or, if a nobler,—and perhaps a more just,—expression be preferred, that they should all have gravitated towards this rising sun, as to a natural and inevitable centre of attraction. Their interests, even the interests of their art, and their concern for their dignity invited them to adopt this course. Admitting, for example, that

approved by Louis XIV.;—and of the vexations which *Tartuffe* procured him.

That these vexations coincide with the critical period of Molière's life;—with his connubial misfortunes;—and with the early stages of his illness.—Was his faith in his philosophy of "nature" shaken in consequence?—The doubtful and almost enigmatical character of the plays he produced between 1664 and 1669: *Don Juan*, 1665; *Le Misanthrope*, 1666; *Tartuffe* (the second), 1667; *L'Avare*, 1668; *Georges Dandin*, 1668.—The signification of these plays is not clear;—he seems to admit in them that nature sometimes stands in need of being modified;—he is doubtless undergoing the influence of the "politeness" in vogue around him;—and the obligations he is under as a courtier hinder him from following the bent of his temperament.—At last, however, the authorisation to play *Tartuffe* in public frees him from this restraint, 1669;—and the absurdities of medical science strengthen him in his ideas [Cf. Maurice Raynaud, *Les Médecins au temps de Molière*];—and his plays become as clear as ever they were.

Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, 1669; *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, 1670; *Les fourberies de Scapin*, 1671; *Les femmes savantes*, 1672; *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*, 1672; *Le malade imaginaire*, 1673.—How *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* takes us back to the period of the *Etourdi* and of the *Dépit amoureux*, especially if the *Fourberies de Scapin* be considered together with it.—Similarly the *Femmes savantes* takes us back to the *Précieuses ridicules*;—perhaps without there being any very excellent reasons at the time for the reversion;—and the *Malade imaginaire* takes us back to the *Médecin malgré lui*.—Of the character of Molière's jests at the expense of doctors,—and that the essence of his quarrel with them is that he blames them for wishing to be more skilful than nature.—Nature cannot be "patched up" when once it is "broken up,"—but rather to attempt to patch it up is to break it up altogether [Cf. *Malade*, iii., sc. 3]. "*Nature* they stood in need of a Mæcenas, who should secure them the boon of leisure,—and how could it be otherwise at a period at which the idea had not occurred to men that a writer might live by his pen?—the protection of the king relieved them of the necessity of being the servants of some nobleman or rich citizen, exempted them for the future from writing "dedications *à la Montauron*," and gave them a definite, though doubtless still a modest rank

has veiled our eyes too closely to allow of our fathoming the mysteries of our frame. . . . When a doctor talks to you of . . . again putting the natural functions in full working order . . . he is telling you a medical fairy tale. . . . When we are ill, nature of itself contrives to find a way out of the trouble with which it is beset."

Finally, in Molière's art,—his naturalism shows itself by his choice of his subjects, which are less and less complicated.—There is but very little "matter," to use the expression Racine will shortly employ, and scarcely any plot in the *Misanthrope*, 1666; in *L'Avare*, 1668; in *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, 1670; in *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*, 1672; in *Le Malade imaginaire*, 1673;—or where there is a semblance of a plot, as in the *Femmes savantes*, it is of no interest;—and, in this connection, of the endings of Molière's plays.—In the second place, whereas up to *Tartuffe* Molière introduced none but individual characters into his plays, in his later pieces he is constantly depicting "the family";—as in *L'Avare*; *Georges Dandin*; *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*; *Les femmes savantes*; *Le malade imaginaire*;—and the reason is, that it is only in our relations with others that our ludicrous traits and our vices come into full view and bear all their consequences.—In the third and last place Molière widens more and more his field of observation, so as to make it include the whole of his experience of life:—for instance his knowledge of the provinces in *Pourceaugnac* and *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*;—of the middle classes in *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*;—of the semi-middle class in *Georges Dandin*.—It is as if one were to say that in each successive work he summoned a greater number of spectators;—and a greater variety, to judge of the truth of his delineations;—and to recognise themselves, their children and their neighbours in the pictures of life he offers them.—This is the explanation of the bitterness that underlies a portion of his work;—and, in this connection, of the connection between Naturalism in literature and Pessimism.—Whether this connection, perceived by Molière, did not oblige him, in the social hierarchy. In view of these benefits, of what importance is it that some indulgence in flattery was the price of this protection? And who will argue that Molière, Boileau, Racine, and their fellow writers would have been the greater had they been wanting in gratitude? In reality they were well aware that in a purely aristocratic society neither their talent nor their genius would have sufficed to allow of their accomplish-

from fear of finding himself writing drama, to give more and more room to buffoonery in his later works: *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, *Le Malade imaginaire*:—and whether a measure of sadness is not inherent to all observation of life that is in any way deep?

How Molière escaped the consequences of his naturalism;—and to begin with he did not always escape them;—as for example in *Georges Dandin* or in *Le Malade imaginaire*.—Still, being absolutely in need of the protection of Louis XIV., he endeavoured to fall in with the latter's tastes;—and, in this connection of Molière as a courtier [Cf. *Tartuffe* and *Amphitryon*].—How his principle of subordinating his situations to his characters was yet more efficacious in saving him from his naturalism;—because there are few "characters" in nature, few Tartuffes, Harpagons or Alcestes;—but there are the beginnings of such personages in everybody;—and to develop these beginnings to the full is to add something to nature;—and to outstrip nature while imitating it [Cf. the "types" in Balzac's novels, in *Eugénie Grandet* or *Le Père Goriot*].—That the ideal does not consist solely in the representation of beauty;—but also in the portrayal of characters or of types.—Add to this that most of the more important of Molière's comedies are written to some extent in support of a thesis;—and a thesis, in the drama as in the novel, implies that the writer criticises nature while imitating it;—not to go so far as to say that he proposes to correct nature.—This is exactly Molière's case;—and to this circumstance is due the "satirical" force of his comedy.—Finally, Molière wrote in general in verse;—and prosaic as his verse may be in general,—there are things it is impossible to express in verse.

C. *Molière's influence*;—and that in no branch of literature has the influence of a writer been more considerable upon the works belonging to that particular branch.—His influence on Regnard; the *Folies amoureuses* is merely the *Ecole des femmes* travestied by the ing their work in liberty, of their enforcing the esteem of their adversaries, or of their triumphing over the resistance of the coteries and of opinion. Without the protection of Louis XIV., Molière would have succumbed to the hostility of his enemies; and it was the king in person who overcame the disinclination of the courtiers of the former régime to admire the masterpieces of Racine. They all of them preferred Corneille; and to say nothing here of

introduction, after the Italian fashion, of disguisements and *lazzi*;—the *Légataire universel* is merely a skilful combination of the *Malade imaginaire* and the *Fourberies de Scapin*.—His influence on Le Sage:—*Turcaret* is merely a combination of the *Bourgeois gentilhomme* and the *Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*;—and *Gil Blas* itself is merely a comedy of Molière related in narrative and presented in the form of a novel.—His influence was not less great abroad [Cf. Macaulay, *Le Théâtre anglais sous la Restauration*]. Fielding's comedies are merely "adaptations" of the comedy of Molière;—and the same must be said of one of the masterpieces of English drama Sheridan's *School for Scandal* [Cf. Louis Moland, *Histoire posthume de Molière*].—We again meet with the influence of Molière in Beaumarchais' masterpiece, which is *Le Barbier de Séville* [Cf. for the central idea *L'Ecole des femmes*, and for the subsidiary details, for instance, for the scene of the singing master, the *Malade imaginaire*].—In consequence, one might almost say that for the past two hundred years a comedy has been good in proportion as it has resembled the comedy of Molière;—and mediocre or bad in proportion as it has differed therefrom;—or, in other words, that for two hundred years Molière's comedy has determined the form of "European comedy."

On the other hand Molière has exerted less influence on ideas,—and, as will be seen later on, his attacks on preciosity were entirely unavailing [Cf. Roederer, *Mémoire sur l'histoire de la société polie*].—Why it is that women do not care for Molière.—Was he successful in his attacks on religion?—This, also, does not seem to have been the case;—even his attacks on affected piety were unsuccessful;—admitting his *Tartuffe* to be almost nearer the truth as a picture of the manners of French society in 1690 than as a picture of those manners in 1665 [Cf. La Bruyère].—But he was most unsuccessful of all in his attacks on doctors;—indeed, it is since he scoffed at them that doctors have come to be accepted as veritable guides in matters the cabal of the two *Phèdre*, who is not acquainted with Mme de Sévigné's estimate of the author of *Andromaque*? I fear, too, that had the times been different, such writers as Chapelain and Montausier would have caused the author of the *Satires* to be well beaten, to the damage of their reputation—and to that of the shoulders of the poet. And, finally, ought we to-day to underrate the extent of the services rendered French literature by Louis XIV., rendered almost without an effort, I mean by the sole effect of his

of conscience.—Ought the conclusion to be drawn from Molière's failures that art should have no other object but itself?

No, if a number of persons continue to regard Molière as their master in the matter of conduct.—The exaggeration on this score of Molière's admirers,—and of Sainte-Beuve himself [Cf. *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. v., 1864].—A remark of Goethe [Cf. *Conversations with Eckermann*];—and that neither the perfection of Molière's masterpieces,—nor the trials of his existence should blind us or prevent us calling attention to the limitations of his genius.—His philosophy consists in part in caricaturing or deriding all delicacy [Cf. Bossuet, *Maximes sur la Comédie*, and Rousseau, *Lettre sur les spectacles*];—and that this fact is the explanation of his failure in his conflict with preciosity;—since the "precious" spirit represented in part a legitimate resistance to natural coarseness, and Molière did not refrain from scoffing at this feature of preciosity.—Whether it can be said that this hatred of preciosity is the very essence of the Gallic genius [Cf. Renan, *La Farce de Pathelin*, and *La Théologie de Béranger*].—That a still graver error of Molière, and another error that is perhaps inseparable from the Gallic genius, lies in his having persistently set himself against every idea of restraint and discipline.

It is our master that is our enemy,
This I tell you in plain French. . . .

He must not be reproached with having lacked nobleness and elevation;—since one does not go to comedy for lessons in elevation or nobleness;—the higher sentiments not coming within its scope;—and as much may perhaps be said of too studied politeness.—Still, the greatness of Molière would not suffer had he here and there been less forcible or even less violent when making his points.—And his plays might have inculcated a less easy-going morality.

example and authority, when it is remembered that he obliged men of letters, by causing them to mix with the courtiers, to rid themselves little by little of a certain middle-class self-sufficiency, of a certain rusty pedantry with which they were still besmeared, so to speak; that in this way he secured their admission into the ranks of polite society; and that it is due to him that they acquired, by coming in contact with and frequenting statesmen and men and women of fashion, a number of qualities which

3. THE WORKS.—It will suffice to enumerate here those of Molière's works to which we have not had occasion to refer above. They are: *Le Mèdecin volant*, and *La Jalousie du Barbouillé*, two sketches of dubious authenticity:—*Dom Garcie de Navarre*, 1661; *Les Fâcheux*, 1661; *La Princesse d'Elide*, 1664; *Le mariage forcé*, 1664; *l'Amour médecin*, 1665; *Le médecin malgré lui*, 1666; *Mélicerte*, 1666; *Le Sicilien*, 1667; and *Les amants magnifiques*, 1670;—two pieces of verse: *Le Remerciement au roi* and *La Gloire de Val-de-Grâce*;—and in the last place his *Prefaces* and *Dedications* and his *Petitions to the King* in connection with Tartuffe.

The principal editions are, as regards original editions or editions deserving to be regarded as such, the edition of 1666;—that of 1673;—that of 1674;—and that of 1682 by Lagrange and Vivot. These four editions form a first connected batch to which may be added the Elzevir editions. The edition of 1682, which some publishers adopt as their standard even to-day, is as incorrect as it is ugly.

Next in order come: the edition of 1734 [with the commentary of Joly and La Serre and Bouchers' illustrations] 6 vols. in 4to, Paris, Prault;—and the edition of the "Librairies associés" [with Bret's commentary and Moreau's illustrations], Paris, 1773. The first is the finer, and the second the more estimable.

Among the many modern editions may be cited: A Regnier's edition, 5 vols. 4to, Paris, 1878, Imprimerie Nationale;—and the edition in the series of the "Grands Ecrivains," edited by Mme Eugène Despois and Paul Mesnard, Paris, 1873–1893, Hachette, 11 vols. in 8vo.

III.—**Jean de La Fontaine** [Château-Thierry, 1621; † 1695, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Baillet, *Jugements des savants*, vol. v. of the edition

are not come by as a rule in the back parlour of a "master upholsterer" or in the household of a clerk of the Courts?

For it is at this juncture that under the combined influence of all these causes, French literature becomes at once really *human*, in the widest sense of the word, and really *naturalist* or *natural*. What is more "natural" than the comedy of Molière unless it be the tragedy of Racine; and what is more human? It is by this cha-

---

of 1722, No 1551 [Cf. Furetèire's second *Factum*];—Louis Racine, *Mémoires sur la vie de son père*, 1747;—Matthieu Marais, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de la Fontaine*, published for the first time in 1811;—Walckenaër, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de La Fontaine*, Paris, 1820, 1822, 1824, 1858;—Paul Mesnard's biographical notice preceding the *La Fontaine* in the series of the "Grands Ecrivains," Paris, 1883.

C. Robert, *Fables inédites des XII^e, XIII^e et XIV^e siècles* and *Fables de La Fontaine*, Paris, 1825;—Lessing, *Abhandlungen über die Fabel* [1759], vol. viii. of the collected edition of his works published by Göschen, 1868, Leipsic;—Saint-Marc Girardin, *La Fontaine et les Fabulistes*, a series of lectures delivered in 1858–1859, and published in 1867, Paris;—Max Muller, *La Migration des fables*, in his *Essais de mythologie comparée*, London and Paris, 1870.

Chamfort, *Eloge de La Fontaine*, 1774;—Taine, *La Fontaine et ses fables*, Paris, 1853–1860;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i., 1829, and *Causeries*, vol. xiii., 1857;—G. Lafenestre, *La Fontaine* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1895.

Damas-Hinard, *La Fontaine et Buffon*, Paris, 1861;—P. de Rémusat, *La Fontaine naturaliste*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 1, 1869; — Nicolardot, *La Fontaine et la Comédie humaine*, Paris, 1885.

Marty-Laveaux, *Essai sur la langue de la Fontaine*, Paris, 1853:—Th. de Banville, *La Fontaine*, 1861, in Crépet's collection of French poets, vol. ii., and at the end of the 2nd edition of his *Petit traité de poésie française*, Paris, 1881.

2. THE ARTIST, THE MAN AND THE POET.—The first part of La Fontaine's life [1621–1660].—His neglected education;—his sojourn at the Oratory;—his marriage [1647];—and that were it not for

racter of humanity that the work of these writers differs from, though at the same time it be a continuation of, the tragedy of Corneille, the novel of La Caprenède and the burlesque comedy of Scarron,—*l'Ecolier de Salamanque* or *Dom Japhet d'Arménie*,—and as La Fontaine says in speaking of the *Fâcheux :*

> We have changed our method,
> Jodelet is no longer in fashion,
> *And now it is incumbent on us*
> *To follow nature with the utmost closeness.*

Molière, he would doubtless have been merely a " Précieux" and a "libertine."—His adaptation of the "Eunuch" of Terence, 1654.—He is pensioned by Superintendent Fouquet, 1657.—His Sonnets, Madrigals, and Ballads.—His poem *Adonis* [Cf. the *Adonis* of Shakepeare], 1658.—*Le Songe de Vaux*, 1658;—*Elegie aux nymphes de Vaux*, 1661.—La Fontaine's relations with Molière, Boileau, and Racine [Cf. the prologue to *Psyché*, and Scherer, *Le Cabaret du Mouton blanc* in his *Etudes critiques*].—He exchanges the protection of Fouquet for that of the Duchesse de Bouillon [Cf. Amédée Renée, *Les Nièces de Mazarin*].—The first of the *Contes*, 1664–1666;—and the early *Fables*, 1668.

La Fontaine's character.—His easy-going nature and his egoism;—his lack of dignity;—his parasitism.—What would have become of the social status of the man of letters if there had been many La Fontaines?—La Fontaine's "riskiness" (*gauloiserie*);—and what is to be understood by this word [Cf. Taine *La Fontaine et ses fables*].—Of the danger that might attach to treating La Fontaine with too much indulgence;—that his *Contes* are, in general, unwholesome productions;—and that he contrives to be even more licentious than Boccaccio, where he follows his text [Cf. Marc Monnier, *La Renaissance de Dante à Luther*, Paris, 1884].—The reception accorded the *Contes* by his contemporaries.—That La Fontaine's naïveté prevented him neither from depicting himself as a beau in the prologue to *Psyché*;—nor from having amply sufficient cunning to allow of his "eating the bread of idleness";—and how, in defiance of morality, some of his finest qualities were the outcome of his very defects.

A. *The Artist.*—A remark of Mme de la Sablière on the subject of "the *Fablier*."—For the very reason that he never took life seriously and that he lived, as it were, outside it, life for him was never anything more than a spectacle.—In what respect this disposition of mind is

It is well understood, however, that this close imitation of nature shall be confined to the copying of the most general and permanent characteristics observed in it, and shall not include the rendering of any of the accidental features, of the exceptions and deformities that distort or corrupt it,—that make nature, in fact, "unnatural." Indeed, although there is no doubt that a man who is one-eyed, lame, or humpbacked, is still a

eminently that of the "artist" [Cf. G. Flaubert, *Préface pour les œuvres de L. Bouilhet*];—and that this disposition, coupled with La Fontaine's desultory existence, explains how it was that his *Fables* were works of a character unique at the time.—Corneille had been a writer with a purpose;—Molière had written in support of this or that thesis and had engaged in conflicts;—La Fontaine merely aimed at depicting what pleased him;—or even had no aim whatever except that of pleasing himself.—This attitude affords the key to the character of his alleged satire;—and Taine's exaggeration on this score.—That men are perverted and that women are gossips;—that the rich are insolent, and that the poor are invariably obsequious;—that the great abuse their authority and that the humble allow themselves to be trodden on;—or, finally, that the lion is the king of animals, and that the ass is eternally a dupe;—that such things should be, never irritates La Fontaine or arouses his indignation;—and yet that they should do so is the primary condition of satire.—Satire cannot exist unaccompanied by a moral purpose.—La Fontaine merely "observes"; he never passes judgment.—His maliciousness never goes further than the amusement a poor philosopher may find in convicting the great of this world of foolishness;—he is of opinion, too, that whatever is human, since it is "natural," has an equal claim upon the attention of the artist;—and in this way his artistic epicureanism leads him insensibly to naturalism.

B. *The Naturalist.*—That in applying this word to La Fontaine, it would be going too far to make it mean that he was a curious observer of the habits of animals [Cf. Paul de Rémusat, *La Fontaine naturaliste*];—it is even a question whether he was a very close observer of their habits.—Of scientific truth and poetic truth.—That, in any case, it is sufficient that La Fontaine's animals should be something more for him than mere human beings in disguise;—and in point of fact, they fulfil this condition.—They possess for him a very individual and clearly defined character;—they have their peculiar outward man, it is held, and quite rightly, not altogether that the sight or the representation of such beings is painful, but that they themselves fall short, as it were, of the definition of a man. Similarly, while the reality of an Attila, of a Jodelet, or of a Dom Japhet d'Arménie is not denied,—though the denial might be made, were it desired,—it is held that the characteristics which distinguish these personages from ordinary mortals, cause them to be exceptions,

aspect;—and more especially they have idiosyncrasies.—But in describing him as a naturalist what is meant is: That in his case, his curiosity with respect to and the freedom with which he imitates nature was never restrained or moderated;—by any necessity of "playing the courtier"; —by obligations of the kind which the exigencies of the stage imposed on Molière and Racine;—or by any moral consideration.—It resulted that his interests were wider than those of many of his contemporaries;—and in consequence that his work contains and depicts more of nature than the work of any of his contemporaries.—They, for their part, merely depicted man and not even the whole of man;—the reverse is the case with the La Fontaine;—who goes to the length of showing us man in attitudes he had better have left alone.—He also depicted animals;—a circumstance which gives life to his fables and distinguishes them from the jejune Aesopian fable [Cf. Lessing, *Abhandlungen*].—He also introduced into his work the stars, the sky, water, an entire "exterior nature," which is absent from the work of his contemporaries.—Herein lies the charm of his work;—and it is this characteristic that renders it eminently suitable, in one respect at least, and despite what has been said to the contrary [Cf. J. J. Rousseau, *Emile*] for the education of children.—Children derive from an acquaintance with La Fontaine's fables much the same benefits as from visits to a zoological garden;—and supposing children to learn from the fables that "people must not be judged by appearances," or that "humble folk are the victims of the folly of great personages," what harm is done?—The same characteristic of familiarity is also met with in his style.—However studied his style may be it is still that of a "naturalist";—owing to the freedom with which he chooses his words;—he does not draw the line at words of any class;—owing to his rare employment of abstract terms, or to his happy way of accompanying such terms with popular expressions;—and, finally, owing to his free and easy phraseology, he is always more inclined to follow the dictates of sensibility than the rules of logic.

and place them outside nature and humanity. This is all as yet—for care must be taken not to confound one epoch with another! Nothing more is aimed at than to please the average man. But to please him it is necessary in the first place to enter into his feelings, and since it is imperative that we should ourselves have experienced these feelings before we can be acquainted with them and before we can give them expression, it comes about

How the "naturalism" of La Fontaine brings him into touch with Molière;—and that both of them have the same "philosophy";—though in the case of La Fontaine it is less reasoned than in that of Molière.—La Fontaine is a practical but not a militant Epicurean;—he is as much of the school of Saint-Evremond as of that of Molière,—more concerned with enjoying life than with preaching;—and sufficiently easy-going not to be ruffled when fortune elects to trouble his enjoyment.—However, he is above everything else a poet;—and it is this last characteristic that definitely distinguishes him from certain of his illustrious contemporaries.

C. *The Poet.*—A first proof that he is essentially a poet is his choice of irregular or "lyric" verse;—and, in this connection, of the depicting or expression of sentiment by means of diversity of rhythm.—The Alexandrine only became "lyrical" by becoming "romantic," that is to say by abandoning classic uniformity.—Of La Fontaine's versification [Cf. Théodore de Banville, *La Fontaine*].—Lamartine's strange opinion on this subject;—and that when he blamed La Fontaine for his "unequal" verses, he had doubtless forgotten for how many such verses he was responsible for himself.—The poet is also recognisable in La Fontaine in the discreet but perpetual intervention of his own personality in his work;—it is he in person who acquaints us with his tastes and his mode of life,—who even gives us information as to his furniture;—and this is another lyrical characteristic, in view of the limitations imposed on lyricism by the taste of the time.—Add the gift of depicting, of calling up before the eye, material objects;—the rhythm, harmony, and music of his verse;—and the higher gift, displayed even in his *Contes*, of stripping reality of what is too material about it, of spiritualising it.—There are verses of his which are a landscape in themselves:

> But you are born most often
> On the watery shores of the kingdoms of the wind . . .

that what is unusual or singular is eliminated little by little from the conception of literature. "What, Boileau is about to ask, is a new thought? It is in nowise, as the ignorant are disposed to believe, a thought nobody has ever had, or that it is improbable has ever occurred to anybody: *on the contrary it is a thought that must have occurred to every one.*" This point established, let us call to mind one of the Satires or Epistles of Boileau himself, one of the comedies of Molière, the *Ecole des Femmes* or the *Misan-*

There are others that evoke a season of the year:

> When the mild zephyrs have renewed the grass . . .

and there are others which, while they caress the eye and charm the ear, transport us into dreamland and the realm of illusion:

> Softly cradled by calm vapours,
> Her head on her arm and her arm on the cloud,
> Letting flowers fall, and not strewing them . . .

If these qualities make of him a man "unique in his kind," do they sever all connection between him and the literature of his time?—No; and his artistic ideal is in close conformity with that of his illustrious contemporaries.—By his general mode of thinking he is of the family of Molière and of Boileau;—by his mode of depicting and of expression he is of the family of Racine;—and we have said that to start with he belonged to the school of Voiture and Racan.—The main difference between him and his contemporaries lies in the fact that he wrote more especially for himself;—which is doubtless permissible in the Fable as in the Ode;—while it is not permissible in the drama.

The last years of La Fontaine.—Admiration aroused by his *Fables*;—and why did Boileau make no allusion to them in his *Art poétique*?—Suppositions on this score;—and that in any case the *Dissertation sur Joconde* relieves us of the necessity of regarding the fact in a light unfavourable to Boileau.—The successive editions of the *Contes*: 1667; 1669; 1671; 1674;—The lieutenant of police decides to confiscate them.—The *Fables* of 1678 [books, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11].—Testimony of Mme de Sévigné.—The incident in connection with the Academy, 1683.—Did La Fontaine keep the promise he had made "to be on his best behaviour"?—The *Aveux indiscrets* and the *Fleuve Scamandre*.—His relations with Mme d'Hervart,—with the Vendôme *thrope,* one of the tragedies of Racine, *Andromaque* or *Bajazet,* one of the fables of La Fontaine, *Les Animaux malades de la Peste* or *Le Meunier, son Fils et l'Ane,* one of La Rochefoucauld's maxims or one of the sermons of Bossuet or of Bourdaloue. Different as these works may be, their chief merit is to belong to all periods and to all countries, to depict man in general and not merely the Frenchman of the seventeenth century, to be *natural* in that they are *human, human* because they are *natural.*

family [Cf. Desnoiresterres, *Les cours galantes* and *La jeunesse de Voltaire*]—with Mme Ulrich [Cf. *Œuvres de la Fontaine*, Regnier's edition, letters 26 and 27].—That it is unfortunate that we should know nothing of the poet's last protectress except what we learn from the police records.—The illness and conversion of La Fontaine in 1692.—He takes to writing pious poetry.—His last letter to his friend Maucroix,—and his death.

3. THE WORKS.—In addition to his *Fables*, of which the dates of publication have been given above, La Fontaine is the author :—(1) of five books of *Contes*, of which the dates have also been given ;—(2) five Poems : *Adonis*, 1658, published for the first time in 1669 ; *Quinquina*, 1682 ; *La captivité de saint Malc*, 1673 ; *Philémon et Baucis* ; and *Les Filles de Minée*, 1685 ;—(3) various poems, including six Elegies, nine Odes, thirteen Ballads, twenty-five Epistles, and a number of *Dizains*, *Sizains*, *Chansons*, *Madrigaux*, etc. ;—(4) some minor works in prose, interspersed with verse : *Psyché et Cupidon* ; *Le Songe de Vaux* [a fragment] ; *Lettres à sa femme* ;—and (5) his Dramas, of which there are twelve in all, from his adaptation of *L'Eunuque*, 1654, to the two first acts of a piece entitled *Achille*, published for the first time in 1785. La Fontaine was destitute of dramatic genius.

The separate editions of the *Contes* and of the *Fables* are too numerous for it to be possible to give even the principal of them here, and we shall confine ourselves to mentioning, on account of the beauty of their illustrations, the edition of the *Fables*, 1735–1759, 4 vols. in folio, illustrated by Oudry ;—and the edition of the *Contes* known as that of the "Fermiers Généraux," Amsterdam [Paris], 1 vol. in 8vo, 1762, illustrated by Eisen.

The best editions of the complete works are : the successive editions brought out by Walckenaer, who made the life and works of La

Indeed—were I not afraid of the expression appearing somewhat metaphysical,—I would say of these works that they are fragments of nature and humanity shown under their eternal aspect.

Their human character does not prevent them being *national* at the same time: and by the word national I would express three things, which go together, but which it is possible and necessary to distinguish. Henceforth our writers esteem, that were they to take lessons from

Fontaine his own special property as it were, Paris, 1822, 1826, 1835, 1838, 1840;—Marty-Laveaux' edition, in the "Bibliothèque Elzévirienne," Paris, 1857–1877;—and H. Regnier's edition, in the "Grands Ecrivains" series, Paris, 1883–1892, Hachette.

IV.—**Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet** [Dijon, 1627; † 1704, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Lévesque de Burigny, *Vie de Bossuet*, 1761;—Cardinal de Bausset, *Histoire de Bossuet*, Paris, 1814;—Floquet, *Études sur la vie de Bossuet*, Paris, 1855; and *Bossuet précepteur du Dauphin*, 1864;—Abbé Guettée, *Journal* [1 vol.] and *Mémoires* [3 vols.] *de l'abbé Le Dieu*, Paris, 1856;—Abbé Réaume, *Histoire de Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet*, Paris, 1869;—Abbé Delmont, *Quid conferant latina Bossuetii opera ad cognoscendam illius vitam . . .* Paris, 1896.

P. de la Rue, *Oraison funèbre de Bossuet*, 1704;—Maury, *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire*, 1777;—Dom Deforis, in his notices preceding the volumes of the first edition of Bossuet's sermons, 1772;—Jacquinet, *Les Prédicateurs du XVII^e^ siècle avant Bossuet*, Paris, 1863 and 2nd edition, 1885:—Abbé Vaillant, *Études sur les sermons de Bossuet*, Paris, 1851;—Gandar, *Bossuet orateur*, Paris, 1867; and Edmond Scherer's review of this book, *Études*, 1867;—Abbé Lebarq, *Histoire critique de la prédication de Bossuet*, Paris, 2nd edition, 1891;—Freppel, *Bossuet et l'éloquence sacrée au XVII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1893.

Gérin, *Recherches sur l'assemblée du clergé de France en 1682*, Paris, 1870, 2nd edition;—Abbé J. T. Loyson, *L'Assemblée du clergé de France en 1682*, Paris, 1870 [Cf. the books of J. de Maistre, *Du Pape* and *De l'Eglise gallicane*, the second of which in particular is directed against Bossuet].

Voltaire, *Essai sur les moeurs*;—Turgot, *Discours de Sorbonne* and the foreigner, from the Spaniards, or the Italians, as their fathers had done and a few of their belated contemporaries were still doing, they would be false to the guiding spirit of the reign, and guilty of a public act of ingratitude to the sovereign who has accorded them his protection. It is for this reason that they refuse to consider the works, which had been most admired by the preceding generation,—Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* or Georges de Montemayor's *Diane enamourée*, for example

Fragments historiques, vol. ii. of his collected works;—Herder, *Idées sur la philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité.*

Rébelliau, *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme*, Paris, 1891.

Abbé Bellon, *Bossuet, directeur de conscience*, Paris, 1895.

Abbé de la Broise, *Bossuet et la Bible*, Paris, 1890.

Th. Delmont, *Bossuet et les saints Pères*, Paris, 1896.

Tabaraud, *Supplément aux histoires de Bossuet et de Fénelon*, Paris, 1822;—A. Bonnel, *La controverse de Bossuet et de Fénelon sur le quiétisme*, Mâcon, 1850;—Guerrier, *Madame Guyon, sa vie et sa doctrine*, Paris, 1881:—Crouslé, *Bossuet et Fénelon*, Paris, 1894.

Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. x., 1854; vol. xii., 1856; vol. xiii. 1857; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. xii.—Poujoulat, *Lettres sur Bossuet*, Paris, 1854;—G. Lanson, *Bossuet*, Paris, 1891.

2. THE LIFE, THE RÔLE AND THE INFLUENCE OF BOSSUET.—Bossuet never having written a line that was not an act, the history of his life is inseparable from that of his work.—His birth, and that it is important to keep in view that he came of a family of magistrates;—his studies at Dijon [collège des Godrans];—and in Paris at the college of Navarre and at the Sorbonne.—He is ordained priest and appointed archdeacon of Sarrebourg, 1652;—his sojourn at Metz [Cf. Floquet, vol. ii. and Gandar, *Bossuet orateur*];—and that it is at Metz, from 1653–1659, that he, as it were, fixed on almost all his ideas.—Did Bossuet traverse a period of doubt?—and in what sense the question must be understood.—An observation as to his character and that few men have less resembled their style.—That it does not appear, however, that his doubts ever shook the foundation of his faith.—To what extent his perplexities resembled those of Pascal and to what extent they differed from them.—Of Bossuet's predilection for Saint Chrysostom among the Greek Fathers, and for Saint Augustin among the Fathers of the Latin Church.—Whether, in the course of

—otherwise than as the obstacle which has hindered them too long from being themselves. To appreciate this feeling, it is only necessary to read Boileau's *Dissertation sur Joconde*,—which is one of his first works,—and to note with what assurance he accords La Fontaine the superiority over Ariosto, in a case were the former is treating a subject borrowed from the latter! His attitude is tantamount to a declaration that in a work of art the subject is of no account, while the style is all important;

his studious life, he did not somewhat neglect the study of men?—Difference in this respect between him and Pascal.—His first published work: *La Réfutation du catéchisme de Paul Ferry*, 1665.—His first sermons [Cf. Gandar, and more especially Lebarq, *Histoire critique*].—He takes up his residence in Paris, 1659.

A. *Bossuet's Sermons.*—The history of Bossuet's sermons [Cf. Lebarq, *Histoire critique*].—He preached in Paris:—in 1660, the Lenten sermons at the Minimes of the Place Royale;—in 1661, the Lenten sermons at the Carmelites of the Faubourg Saint-Jacques;—in 1662, the Lenten sermons before the Court;—in 1665, the Advent sermons before the Court;—in 1666, the Lenten sermons before the Court;—in 1668, the Advent sermons at Saint-Thomas du Louvre;—and in 1669 the Advent sermons before the Court.—The *Oraison funèbre de Nicolas Cornet*, 1663, and the funeral oration on the Queen of England, 1669, must be included in the same period.—The latter sermon is the second work he published, at the desire of Madame the Duchesse d'Orléans.—Bossuet's three "manners."—The first is more especially "theological and didactic" [Cf. *Sermon sur la Bonté et la Rigueur de Dieu*;—*Premier sermon pour Vendredi Saint*;—*Panégyrique de saint Gorgon*;—*Panégyrique des saints Agnès gardiens*].—The sermons in this manner are longer than those that followed them; more encumbered with dissertations;—less skilfully composed;—they offer too a realism of expression that is sometimes excessive:—but for this very reason they are more "coloured."—The masterpiece of this first manner is the *Panégyrique de saint Paul*, 1657—in which moreover the second manner is foreshadowed.—This second manner is more especially "philosophic and moral";—although not at all "lay" on this account;—moreover, these distinctions are not to be taken too literally [Cf. the sermons: *sur la Providence*, 1656 and 1662,—*sur la Mort*, 1662,—*sur l'Ambition*, 1662 and 1666,—*sur le* and since it was generally admitted that we were justified in regarding the Greeks and more especially the Romans as ancestors rather than as foreigners, it is by freeing itself, by means of originality of style, from all foreign influence, that our literature takes the first step towards becoming truly national.

It makes further progress in this direction by developing henceforth, out of its own resources, and shut off, as it were, from every external influence, certain more deep-

Délai de la conversion, 1665,—*sur la Justice*, 1666,—*pour la fête de la Toussaint*, 1669].—Bossuet, like Pascal, endeavours to prove that religion, independently of the numerous other reasons that make belief in it incumbent, is of all the "philosophies" that which offers the best explanation of man and nature.—The composition is at once freer and more original;—the style, while perhaps less coloured, has more spaciousness and movement, is more oratorical, or it may even be said more "lyric."—Finally, and if only the sermons proper be taken into account, the third manner might rather be described as "homiletic,"—by which is meant less strained, more indulgent, and above all less imperious;—in the sermons in this manner there is less of the spirit of the Bible or of the Old Testament and more of that of the Gospels [Cf. the sermons: *pour la Pentecôte*,—(the third) *pour la fête de la Circoncision*,—(the third) *pour le jour de Noël*].—The sermons in this last manner are fewer in number;—doubtless because Bossuet had come to improvise with greater ease; and it must be remembered that they were contemporary with the most important Funeral Orations.

Did Bossuet's contemporaries appreciate his sermons at their full value?—Evidence on this subject [Cf. *Études critiques*, vol. v., *l'Éloquence de Bossuet*].—In any case it seems that the glory of the controversialist was prejudicial to that of the orator.—To say of Bossuet that he was too superior to his audience to be appreciated by it, is to make a strange mistake with respect to listeners who were Pascal's readers and Racine's spectators.—A remark of Nisard on this subject.—It is also not to recognise the way in which eloquence exerts its influence.—That if, as Voltaire declares, "Bossuet ceased to be accounted the first among the preachers from the moment Bourdaloue appeared," the reason is very simple;—it is that Bourdaloue made his appearance in the Paris pulpits just as Bossuet was leaving them,—

lying qualities it is somewhat difficult to define, but the "national" character of which is evinced by the circumstance that foreigners, to whom they do not appeal, are blind to them. Among them are some of the qualities which Frenchmen esteem more highly, perhaps, than any others in Racine: depth and subtlety of analysis and moral observation; a style of apparent but studied negligence, and of a suppleness that may be said to respond to the most hidden movements of passion; harmony of

---

and was only to mount them again at rare intervals;—owing to his being appointed bishop of Condom, 1669;—and tutor to the Dauphin, 1670.

B. *Bossuet's rôle at Court.*—He publishes his *Exposition de la doctrine de l'Église sur les matières de controverse*, 1671;—he endeavours to estrange Louis XIV. from Mme de Montespan;—his "Letters to the King," 1675;—his "Letter to Marshal de Bellefonds," 1675.—Was Bossuet wanting in courage on this occasion?—and what could he have done in addition to what he did?—Of the education of the Dauphin, and of the way in which Bossuet conducted it [Cf. the *Lettre au pape Innocent XI.*, March 8, 1679].—The question of the "régale" and the assembly of the clergy [Cf. Gérin and Loyson].—Was Louis XIV. prepared to go as far as a schism?—The sermon *sur l'unité de l'Église*, 1681.—How the parliamentary traditions of his family;—his education at the Sorbonne;—the complaisance of a faithful subject and of a good Frenchman;—and the idea he had formed of Pope Innocent XI., induced Bossuet to take up the attitude he adopted on this occasion.—Characteristic remarks of Joseph de Maistre in his book, *de l'Église gallicane* [bk. ii., ch. 8].—The four articles.—Marriage of the Dauphin, 1680;—Bossuet is appointed chaplain to the Dauphine, 1680;—and the following year bishop of Meaux.

C. The *Discours sur l'histoire universelle.*—Of all the writings Bossuet composed for the education of the Dauphin, the *Discours* is the only one Bossuet published himself.—His reasons for publishing it;—and that they are analogous to those which led Pascal to compose his apology.—Of the criticisms of which the *Discours* has been the object, and that some of them do not take into account that the *Discours* which has come down to us was to have been followed by a second;—that others are the consequence of the *Discours* not proportion; and in general all the qualities, which, it must be admitted, the oratorical character of his tragedies seems to place beyond the ken of all those who are not of French birth. To the same category belong certain of the qualities of Bossuet. Universal justice is rendered to the vigour and precision of his language; he is admired as an historian and as a controversialist; and homage is paid the orator, who was more abundant than Cicero and more nervous than Demosthenes. I am not certain

---

being read aright, and of its second part being neglected: the part entitled *La suite de la Religion.*—And yet this second part is the more important;—in this sense, that in it Bossuet replies: to the attacks of the "libertines" on religion;—to Spinoza's *Traité théologico-politique*;—and to the new-born exegesis of Richard Simon. —Beauty of the scheme of the *Discours.*—Simplicity, vigour, and majesty of the style.—To what extent has modern erudition destroyed the value of the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*?—Confession of Renan on this point; and that the final effort of his "philology" was to recognise that there were only "three histories of paramount interest: Grecian, Roman, and Jewish"; and that in consequence to lead up from the two first to their point of contact with the third, even though it be only a method, is the right method.—That, this point conceded, Bossuet's judgments on particular incidents retain a real, "scientific" value;—and contain observations, the justice and depth of which have not since been surpassed.—It should be added that he founded the "philosophy of history" as a part of European literature [Cf. Robert Flint, *La Philosophie de l'Histoire*].

D. *Bossuet's leading idea*: the reunion of the Churches.—What were his reasons for believing this reunion possible.—Numerous conversions in which he had a share.—The conversion of Turenne.—Difficulties experienced by the Protestants in refuting the doctrine of the *Exposition.*—The *Conférence avec M. Claude*, 1682.—The great *Oraisons funèbres.*—The progress of "libertinism" and the *Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague.*—The *Oraison funèbre de Michel Le Tellier* and the repeal of the Edict of Nantes.—That just as the idea of Providence dominates all Bossuet's philosophy, so the idea or the dream of the reunion of the Churches dominates all his controversial writings.—That this circumstance explains:—his indulgent attitude [Cf. Ingold, *Bossuet et le Jansénisme*, Paris, 1897] towards Jansenism;

whether the fund of naturalness, of simplicity, and I will venture to say of familiarity, that underlies the splendour of his inimitable eloquence is appreciated outside France, where it may be, too, full justice is not done to his remarkable freedom from rhetoric, artificiality, and self-sufficient literary vanity. Again, to take La Fontaine, how many foreigners are there who understand the rare admiration we have for the unique combination he offers of easy-going Epicureanism, Gallic maliciousness,

—his severity towards the Casuists;—his rôle in the assembly of 1682;—and his apologetic method.—In his opinion only one question separates Protestants and Catholics: the question of the Church;—and his only reason for writing his *Histoire des variations* was to show by what sure signs the true Church is to be recognised.

E. The *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes*, 1688.—Recent discussions on this subject [Cf. Rébelliau, *Bossuet historien*]; and that Bossuet showed himself a true historian in this great work. His solid erudition;—his acute and impartial criticism.—Moreover, in this book, which is too little read, are to be found some of the finest passages Bossuet ever wrote. The portraits in the *Histoire des variations*;—the narrative passages;—the dialectics.—Sobriety, vigour, and fluency of Bossuet's style.—Effect produced by the *Histoire des variations*.—It is attacked by Burnet and by Jurien in his *Lettres pastorales*.—Bossuet replies to Burnet in his *Défense de l'Histoire des Variations*, 1691;—and to Jurien by his *Avertissements aux Protestants*, 1689–1691.—In what sense the *Avertissements* form a constituent part of the *Histoire des variations*.—The three first *Avertissements* [Cf. Pressensé, *Les trois premiers siècles de l'Église chrétienne*; and Ad. Harnak, *Lehrbuch der Dogmen Geschichte*, 2nd edition, Fribourg, 1888–1890];—the fourth *Avertissement* dealing with Christian marriage;—the sixth *Avertissement*; and whether in it Bossuet did not foresee, point out and describe in advance, the evolution of contemporary Protestantism?—That in any case the problem continues to turn upon the reconciliation of Protestant individualism with the pretension of Protestantism to found churches.—Of the masterly clearness of Bossuet's treatment of these difficult and obscure questions;—and that even in his sermons there is nothing more oratorical than in the *Avertissements* or in the *Histoire des variations*.

and unalloyed poetry? Above all they have a difficulty in comprehending how it is that a writer who, more than any of his fellows, "went to the ancients for his inspiration" should be "the most French of our poets"; that a collection of Fables, every one of which is borrowed from a foreign source, should yet be wholly creative work throughout.

There is still another point, however, for in my opinion the most *national* feature of all these works is precisely

F. *Other works of Bossuet.*—His *Defensio cleri gallicani* [posthumous work].—His *Défense de la tradition et des saints Pères* directed against Richard Simon.—Bossuet's respect for tradition.—Opinion of the Brandenburg envoy upon Bossuet's rôle [Cf. Ezéchiel Spanheim, *Relation de la cour de France en 1690*].—Correspondence with Leibnitz [Cf. Foucher de Careil, *Œuvres de Leibnitz*, vols. i. and ii., Paris, 1867].—The *Maximes sur la comédie*, 1693.—The Quietist episode.—How Bossuet came to be mixed up in it without such being his intention.—Importance of the question, and how it was complicated by a political question [Cf. A. Griveau, *Étude sur la condamnation du livre des Maximes des saints*, Paris, 1878].—The party of the Dauphin and that of the Duc de Bourgogne [Cf. the correspondence of *Madame duchesse d'Orléans*].—Of Bossuet's rôle in the controversy.—His conception of mysticism.—His writings: *Instruction sur les États d'oraison*, and *Relation sur le quiétisme*, 1697–1698.—That if during the heat of the conflict he was wanting in "charity," his adversaries were wanting in frankness.—The last years of Bossuet [1700–1704].—He finishes off the works he had long had in hand.—He finishes his *Politique*;—his *Élévations* and his *Méditations*;—he resumes writing his *Défense de la tradition et des saints Pères*.—His work as a director of consciences.—His family preoccupations and his weakness for his nephew.—His solicitations of the king.—His death.

G. The *Élévations sur les mystères* and the *Méditations sur l'Évangile*.—The conditions under which these two works were written;—and that Bossuet's aim was to embody in them the substance of his sermons.—He resorted to the same process in his *Politique* [Cf. the sermons: *sur les Devoirs des rois*, and *sur la Justice*].—It is possible, too, that in the *Méditations* and the *Élévations* there is something of what Bossuet had had to learn over again in order to combat Fénelon.—Plan of the *Élévations* and of the

the impossibility by which we are confronted of distinguishing in them between what is properly and purely French and what is universal. They possess the quality of universality, and yet it is inconceivable that they should have seen the light except in the France of the seventeenth century! While belonging to all times and to every country, not only are they of their own time and their own country, but the fact that they are so seems to constitute a part at least of their originality. In this

Méditations.—Originality of the former work and its philosophical import.—The first "weeks" of the *Élévations* contain some of Bossuet's finest inspirations.—Of the accent of tenderness there is in the *Méditations*;—and, in this connection, of Bossuet's gentleness of character.—Testimony on this point:—of Père de la Rue in his funeral oration;—of Abbé Le Dieu in his *Journal*;—of Saint-Simon in his *Mémoires*.—That the very letters of the *Élévations* and the *Méditations* are evidence of the lyric element there was in Bossuet's temperament [Cf. Vigney's *Élévations* and Lamartine's *Méditations*].—That for this reason the *Élévations* and the *Méditations*, taken together, are perhaps the most "personal" of Bossuet's works;—and in this way by leading him back to the preoccupations of his early years they give his life an harmonious ending:—after the enthusiasm of his youth, the agitation, the cares, and the conflicts of his maturity;—perhaps, too, the weaknesses;—and to end with his retirement into the sanctuary of lofty ideas and of hope.

H. *Of the influence exerted by Bossuet on his contemporaries,*—and of the injustice of the reproach that has been addressed him [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, and Renan in his introduction to Kuenen's *Histoire de l'Ancienne Testament*] of not having foreseen Voltaire.—How, on the contrary, a part of his work is directed against the "libertines";—how the object of another part is to prevent the increase of the difficulties in the way of belief;—and how finally another part proves that he was alive to the fact that the chief danger run by religion lay in the division among Christians [Cf. *Sermons sur la Vérité de la réligion*, 1665;—*Oraison funèbre de la Princesse Palatine*, 1685;—*Lettre à un disciple du P. Malebranche*, 1687;—*Sixième Avertissement aux protestants*, 1691].—That he also foresaw what would be the outcome of Richard Simon's method of criticism;—and that he cannot reasonably be found fault with for not having sense they are the equivalent of the Italian painting of the Renaissance or of the Greek sculpture of the best period, the very universality of whose masterpieces is proof of their national character, since, although they have been imitated everywhere, they have nowhere been even reproduced, let alone equalled. The case is the same with Racine's tragedies or Molière's comedies; and the fact that it is difficult to explain this mystery is no reason for denying it. Above we said of these works that

admitted with the "father of modern exegesis" that the Bible is a book of the nature of the Iliad or the Ramayana.—That in reality Bossuet was the master for nearly a century of orthodox thought;—in consequence, it is against him that the "philosophers" will soon direct their principal efforts;—and for this reason Voltaire cannot be understood without a previous acquaintance with Bossuet.

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Bossuet, which form some forty volumes [in the Versailles edition] may be divided into *Exegetical Works*;—*Works of Edification and Piety*;—*Controversial and Polemical Works*; *Works* composed for the instruction of the Dauphin;—and *Miscellaneous Works.*

A. His *Exegetical Works* scarcely come within our scope, as they are written in Latin;—while those written in French,—such as his *Explication de l'Apocalypse*, 1689; and his two *Instructions sur la version du Nouveau Testament imprimé à Trévoux*,—also form part, and even more properly, of his *Controversial Works.*

B. His *Works of Edification and Piety*, not including his *Pastoral Works*, which moreover are inconsiderable in number, comprise: his *Oratorical Works*, sermons, panegyrics and funeral orations;—his *Élévations sur les mystères*, his *Méditations sur l'Evangile*;—and his *Lettres de direction.*

Of these works, only the six great *Oraisons funèbres*, 1670, 1670, 1683, 1685, 1686, 1687; and the sermon, *l'Unité de l'Église*, 1682, appeared during Bossuet's lifetime.

The *Elévations* and the *Méditations*, which he had himself intended to have printed, did not appear until 1727 and 1730–1731, when they were published by his nephew, the bishop of Troyes.

The *Lettres de direction*, almost all of which are addressed to nuns, and of which the most important are the *Lettres à la sœur Sainte-Bénigne* [Mme Cornuau] and the *Lettres à Mme d'Albert de* they were *natural* in so far as they were *human;* we now have to say of them that they were *national* in so far as they were *universal*, and *universal* in so far as they were *national*.

From these characteristics there proceeds or results a third, which explains the others and is explained by them. It consists in the fact that while all these works are marked by a desire to please, they are animated as well by the ambition to instruct; they are *didactic* or *moral*

Luynes, were published the former in 1746 and 1748 and the latter in 1778.

As to the Sermons, the majority of which exist in manuscript at the Bibliothèque Nationale, they were first published between 1772 and 1778 by Dom Deforis. They were revised by M. Lachat for his edition of Bossuet's works, Paris, 1862, etc. Finally and more recently they were again revised and classified for the first time in chronological order by M. l'abbé Lebarq for his edition of Bossuet's oratorical works, Paris, 6 vols. in 8vo, 1890–1896; Desclée and de Brouwer.

C. The *Works composed for the education of the Dauphin*, or rather in connection with the education of the Dauphin, are: (1) the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, published by Bossuet himself in 1681;—(2) the *Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Ecriture Sainte*, published by his nephew, together with the *Lettre au pape Innocent XI sur l'education du Dauphin* [in Latin], 1709;—(3) the *Traité de la connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même*, published for the first time in 1722, and ascribed to Fénelon, among whose papers it had been discovered, and for the second, under the name of its real author, in 1741;—and (4) the *Abrégé de l'histoire de France*, which appeared for the first time in 1747.

It is the habit to put in this class the *Traité du libre arbitre*, published by the bishop of Troyes in 1731, but we find it difficult to believe that this work was written for the instruction of the Dauphin.

D. The *Controversial Works* include: (1) the works against the Protestants, of which the principal are: the *Exposition de la doctrine de l'Eglise catholique en matière de controverse*, 1671;—the *Conférence avec M. Claude*, 1682;—the *Histoire des variations des églises protèstantes*, 1688;—the six *Avertissements aux protestants*, 1689–

works in the highest and the widest sense of each of the two words. It is only natural that this characteristic should be perceived at a glance in a sermon of Bossuet or of Bourdaloue, in a chapter of Malebranche, or in a satire of Boileau, and it may even seem somewhat superfluous to call attention to its presence. It is already of greater interest to meet with the same intention in the *Maximes* of La Rochefoucauld or the *Fables* of La Fontaine, who of all these great writers is doubtless the most

---

1691;—and the two *Instructions sur les promesses de l'Église*, 1700 and 1701. Hereto must be added the series of dissertations and letters, written with a view to reunite the Protestants of Germany to the Catholic Church, published for the first time in 1753; completed in the successive editions of Bossuet's works; and by M. Foucher de Careil, in the two first volumes of his edition, left unfinished, of Leibnitz, 1867.

2. The works relating to Quietism, of which the principal are:—*Instruction sur les états d'oraison*, 1697;—the collection entitled: *Divers écrits sur les Maximes des saints*, 1698;—and the *Relation du Quiétisme*, 1698.—Add a voluminous Correspondence, which did not appear until 1788, and which takes up three entire volumes of the Versailles edition.

3. The works relating to the Gallican question, almost all of them in Latin.

4. Finally, the works relating to Richard Simon, the principal of which are: the *Instructions sur la nouvelle version du Nouveau Testament donnée à Trévoux*, 1702 and 1703;—and the *Défense de la tradition et des Saints Pères*, which appeared in 1753.

E. A last class may be formed of the *Miscellaneous Writings and Minor Works* and of the *Correspondence* of Bossuet. We shall confine ourselves to citing among these writings:—the *Maximes sur la comédie*, 1693;—the *Traité de la concupiscence*;—the *Traité du libre arbitre*, 1731;—the *Traité de l'usure*, 1753;—and a considerable correspondence [Cf. H. H. Bourreaud, *Histoire des manuscrits et des éditions originales de Bossuet*, Paris, 1897].

The best editions of Bossuet are the Versailles edition in 43 vols. in 8vo, Versailles, 1815–1819, printed by Lebel;—and M. Lachat's edition, 31 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1862, Vivès.—Also Abbé Lebarq's edition of the oratorical works, Paris, 1890–1896.

irregular, or whom indeed there is perhaps too common a disposition at the present day to regard as an exception in his time. As he was well aware "that in France only what pleases is esteemed," that "this is the chief and even the only rule," he was careful to observe this necessary condition! Elsewhere, however, he remarks: "These triflings,—he refers to his *Fables* and not, as might be imagined, to his *Contes*,—these triflings are such in appearance only, for at bottom they have a very sub-

V.—**Jean Racine** [La Ferté-Milon, 1639; † 1699, Paris.]

1. THE SOURCES.—Racine's Correspondence, especially that with Boileau, in the majority of editions of his works;—Louis Racine, *Mémoires sur la vie de son père*, 1747;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, book vi., chap. 10 and 11;—Paul Mesnard's biographical notice preceding his edition of the works.

Saint-Evremond, *Dissertation sur l'Alexandre*, 1670;—Longepierre, *Parallèle de Corneille et de Racine*, in Baillet's *Jugement des savants*, edition of 1722, vol. v., No. 1553 [the article was written in 1686];—La Bruyère, in his *Caractères*, 1688;—Fontenelle, *Parallèle de Corneille et de Racine*, 1693;—Abbé Granet, *Recueil de plusieurs dissertations sur les tragédies de Corneille et de Racine*, 1740;—the brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, 1734–1749, vols. ix., x., xi., xii.;—Stendhal, *Racine et Shakespeare*, 1823 and 1825:—A. Vinet, *Les poètes français du siècle de Louis XIV.*, Paris, 1861;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, 1830; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. iii., 1862, and vol. x., 1866;—Taine, *Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1858;—F. Deltour, *Les ennemis de Racine au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1859;—P. Robert, *La poétique de Racine*, Paris, 1890;—F. Brunetière, *Histoire et littérature*, vol. v.; *Études critiques*, vol. i.; and *Les époques du théâtre français*, 1893;—Jules Lemaître, *Impressions de théâtre*, 1886–1896;—G. Larroumet, *Racine*, in the "Grands Écrivains français" series, 1897.

Marty-Laveaux, *Lexique de la langue de Racine*, Paris, 1873, in the 8th volume of Mesnard's edition.

2. RACINE'S EARLIER YEARS.—His family.—Would it be suspected that he came from the same part of France as La Fontaine?—and in this connection of the theory of environment.—His education at Port-Royal,—and that he was the only one or almost the only one of the

stantial meaning. And just as by the definition of a point, a line and a surface, and by other very familiar principles we become acquainted with sciences which enable us at last to measure heaven and earth, so by the arguments and consequences that may be drawn from these *Fables* the judgment and character are formed, and the reader is rendered capable of great things." Is it necessary that I should point out, that supposing it was never the design of Molière to improve or "purify"

great writers of his time who had a thorough knowledge of Greek;—a knowledge that has left its trace upon his work, into the composition of which there enters, let it be noted to start with, at least as much cleverness and "virtuosity" as genius.—His precocious taste for novels;—his early poems;—*La promenade de Port-Royal*,—and, in this connection, of the sentiment of nature in the seventeenth century.—*La Nymphe de la Seine*, 1660;—Racine's stay at Uzès;—*Les Stances à Parthénice*, 1661–1662 [Cf. Voiture's poem

Je me meurs tous les jours en adorant Sylvie . . .

Ubicini's edition, No. 9];—the *Ode sur la convalescence du roi* and the *Renommée aux Muses*.—None of these poems seemed to foreshadow a dramatic poet;—and at another period perhaps Racine would have been only an elegiac poet;—or a novelist.—A compatriot and one of the youthful friends of La Fontaine, to whom he was related [by Mdlle Héricart, La Fontaine's wife] he might even have joined the ranks of the Précieux had it not been for his liking for actors;—for the gatherings at the *Mouton blanc;*—for his thirst for fame, which at the time the drama was able to satisfy more completely than any other branch of literature;—for the facilities offered him by his friendship with Molière;—and for an inner warmth of passion or genius, which could not rest content with moderate emotions [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*].

Racine's two first tragedies: the *Thébaïde*, 1664,—and *Alexandre*, 1665;—they procure him numerous enemies;—as many as the *Cid* had formerly procured Corneille, while Corneille himself was prominent among them.—Racine's enemies are also those of Boileau and Molière.—In spite of Racine leaving Molière's theatre for the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and of Corneille passing from the Hôtel de Bourgogne to Molière's theatre, the situation remained the same.

morals, at any rate his *Tartuffe*, his *Misanthrope*, or his *Femmes savantes* are there to show that it was certainly his purpose to "modify" or to "mould" them? In a word, it may be said that no great writer of this period separated the idea of art from that of a certain social function or purpose. Far from affecting contempt for the vulgar after the manner of the Précieux and the great writers of the preceding age, far from taking up their cry:

— Racine's estrangement from the leaders of Port-Royal; — and that in writing his *Lettre à l'auteur des Visionnaires*, 1666, he seems publicly to take the defence of the *Tartuffe* party against them [Cf., in the second letter, the passage referring to *Tartuffe*, which would have left little doubt on the matter if the letter had been printed].—How the conflict came to lie between two dramatic schools or systems [Cf. d'Aubignac, *La pratique du théâtre*, 1657];—and how the coinciding of the success of *Andromaque*, 1667 with the failure of *Attila* heightens the antagonism.—*Britannicus*, 1670, and the criticisms of Robinet, Boursault, and Saint-Evremond [Cf. his letter to M. de Lionne].—Madame, duchesse d'Orléans brings the rivalry of the two poets to a pitch, by pitting them against one another on the subject of *Bérénice*;—and, in this connection, of the cruelty that marked her thoughtlessness;—and how fortunate it is for this frivolous and perfidious Henriette that she is defended by her funeral oration.—The preface to *Bérénice*, 1670;—and how the radical antagonism of the two poetical systems is at last brought clearly into view in it.

3. Racine's Poetical System.

A. *The theory of invention.*—Corneille had declared in the preface to his *Héraclius* [edit. Marty-Laveaux, vol. v., p. 147]: "I shall not hesitate to assert that the subject of a fine tragedy ought not to be probable";—and Racine replies to him: "Only what is probable is effective in tragedy" [edit. Mesnard, vol. ii., p. 147].—Consequences of this principle.—(1) The exceptional, extraordinary, and "complex" action found in Corneille's plays is replaced by a simple action, "but little burdened with matter," and turning upon everyday experiences [Cf. the *Cid*, *Héraclius*, *Rodogune*, or *Horace*, on the one hand, and on the other *Andromaque*, *Britannicus*, *Bérénice*, *Bajazet*].—Few men have found themselves in the situation of Horace or of Rodogune,

> Nothing is to my taste, except what is likely to offend
> The judgment of the rude populace;

they endeavoured, as is admirably explained by La Fontaine, to raise this "populace" to their own level. They wrote for "everybody"; and there has never been a doctrine more widely removed than theirs from what has since been termed the paradox of art for art — in whichever of its several senses the expression be taken.

—but many women have known what it is to undergo experiences such as those of Hermione or Bérénice, *invitus invitam.*—A still more decisive comparison is that between *Andromaque* and *Pertharite*, where the subject is the same;—or between *Bajazet* and *Floridon* [Cf. Segrais, *Les divertissements de la princesse Aurélie*].—(2) The imitation of living reality takes the place of romantic combinations.—Fontenelle's remark on the characters of Racine's personages, "which," he says, "are only true to nature because they are commonplace";—and it would be impossible to praise Racine more highly than in this remark intended as a criticism.—Racine's heroes resemble ourselves;—his invention is bolder than Corneille's in the measure in which his subjects are more commonplace;—more in touch with ourselves;—more akin to what goes on around us every day.—Of a mistake of Taine on this point [Cf. *Essais de critique et d'histoire*]—and that of the two, Corneille and Racine, it is assuredly Corneille who is the "Précieux."—(3) The very subject matter with which the invention deals is regarded from a different point of view.—The object is no longer to supplement reality, to embellish it, to arrange it in accordance with "the grand goût";—but to have a better insight into it and to give it better expression.—Racine's singular predilection for subjects already dealt with [Cf. *Les Epoques du théâtre français*];—and how he finds scope for his inventive faculty in treating such subjects.—Molière and La Fontaine regarded invention in the same light;—and this is Fontenelle's grievance against them, when, as he says of Racine, he declares that they are "low by dint of being natural."

B. *Of the psychology and art of Racine;*—and in the first place that they are inseparable;—as are Corneille's "dramatic system" and the "quality of his imagination."—Racine's principal concern is the depiction of character [Cf. Molière in the *Critique de l'École*

The question, too, has been raised whether "the most significant characteristics attaching to the glory of the seventeenth century are not the result of the general march of civilisation, rather than of the influence and destinies of France"? The question was assuredly worth putting. Moreover, if the answer made to it be—and such was the answer of the writer who mooted the question [Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées dans les temps modernes*, vol. i., Paris, 1872]—that "it

---

des femmes, and Boileau, *Epître à Seignelay*].—Unprecedented importance given in his tragedy to the passion of love;—as being the most "common" or the most general of all;—as being the most "natural," and perhaps the most tragic [Cf. Aristotle's remark on Euripides, whom he terms τραγικώτατος];—and finally as being the passion which, while it remains identical in its essence, best displays the diversity of men's characters.—It is a fact that there are fewer ways of being "avaricious" than there are of being "in love";—the love of Hermione is different from that of Bérénice, and the love of Iphigénie from that of Phèdre;—while the love of Néron is no less different from that of Titus, and the love of Achilles from that of Xipharés.—Voltaire's mistake on this point [Cf. his *Temple du goût*].—How a new dramatic system arises out of this diversity in the depiction of character,—a system based, as was clearly seen by Saint-Evremond [Cf. his *Dissertation sur l'Alexandre*], on the subordination of the situations to the characters.—Comparison, in this connection, between *Rodogune* and *Bérénice*. How all the points just enumerated are mutually interdependent,—and turn upon the principle of probability.—Observations on this head;—and that there are entire schools that have based art upon "the exaggeration of the real relations between things."

C. *Racine's style*;—and (1) that it, too, obeys the law involved in the principle of probability,—as regards its degree of naturalness,—and, in this connection, of a remark of Sainte-Beuve: "Racine's style," he has said, "borders, as a rule, on prose, except as regards the invariable elegance of its form."—Accuracy and fruitfulness of this observation.—The truth is there is no prose more simple,—it might almost be said more bare than that of Racine [Cf. his *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal*];—and in his plays it is to this same prose that the passion of his character imparts colour, variety, animation, was the privilege of the France of Louis XIV. to be so situated, that its own movement took the direction of the movement of Europe in general . . . *in such sort as to make it the interpreter or the vehicle of the current ideas of the epoch*," if this be the answer given the question, a vivid light will certainly have been thrown on a period of the history of our literature, and more particularly a good deal will have been done to explain the rapidity of its propagation. At the same time, how it

warmth, and fire.—(2) That the simplicity of Racine's style makes it an incomparable vehicle for psychological analysis;—and in consequence for complex sentiments, which it expresses in the most usual words:

> I loved even the tears I made her shed [BRIT.].
> Take care of her, my hatred demands that she should live [BAJ.].

That this mode of writing is exactly the contrary of that of the Précieux;—who express very simple things in a very complicated manner.—(3) Further, that this simplicity is not prejudicial to the elegance and still less to the boldness of Racine's style;—and that Racine is one of the most daring writers in existence;—his associations of words;—his ideas conveyed by masterly touches [Cf. P. Mesnard, *Étude sur le style de Racine*].—Other qualities of Racine's style;—harmoniousness, life, colour, plasticity [Cf. *Epoques du théâtre français*];—and that the pains he is at to conceal them again leads us back, to finish with, to the principle of probability.

4. THE SECOND PART OF RACINE'S LIFE.—Vexations caused him by his *Mithridate*, 1675;—his *Iphigénie*, 1675;—and finally by *Phèdre*, 1677 [Cf. Deltour, *Les Ennemis de Racine* and Amédée Renée, *Les Nièces de Mazarin*].—The two *Phèdre*.—Whether the very daring of Racine's tragedies was not one of the causes of the implacable animosity of his enemies?—People refused to admit the truth of his depictions of love;—and because they were too "true" they were held to be "excessive."—A remark of Subligny: "I should consider M. Racine very dangerous if he had made this hateful criminal (Phèdre) as pleasing, and as much to be pitied, as he desired to do."—That sufficient stress has not been laid on this feature of Racine's tragedies;—and yet he was thoroughly alive to it himself;—that in asking Arnauld to accord *Phèdre* his approbation, what he really demanded was an "absolution";—and

was that France came by this "prerogative" would still remain to be accounted for; and, without entering on this somewhat long inquiry, may it not be held that the character of our literature, that of French civilisation of the time of Louis XIV., and lastly the influence of Louis XIV. himself are, even in this connection, effects rather than causes? Can it be said that the ideas of Pascal or those of Bossuet, for example, were "in the direction of the movement of Europe in general"?

that having obtained it, it did not satisfy him. — Voisin's evidence in the affair of the Poisons [Cf. Ravaisson, *Archives de la Bastille*, vi, 51].—The innermost cause of Racine's conversion was his abhorrence of his own writings;—and it is for this reason that, having once turned his back upon the stage, he even ceased to concern himself with the new editions of his plays;—and that he devoted himself entirely to his historical studies, and to his family.

His genius, however, far from waning after he had thus sought retirement, gathered strength as its inspiration grew purer.—His *Esther*, 1689, is sufficient to prove this;—and his *Athalie*, 1691.—The conditions under which these two plays were written.—It is noteworthy that in choosing the subject of *Esther*, Racine resorted to a subject that had already been treated six times by previous French dramatists.—Success of *Esther* at Saint-Cyr,—and the vexation, in consequence of Racine's enemies.—The changing opinions of Mme de Sévigné [Cf. the letters dated 1690].—Disdainful criticisms of Mme de La Fayette [*Mémoires*].—*Athalie*, 1691.—The criticisms redouble,—and Racine is more dissatisfied than ever.—In accordance with the opinion of Boileau and Voltaire, should *Athalie* be esteemed Racine's "finest work"?—Racine's last years.—Racine as an historiographer and as a courtier.—His intervention in the quarrel over the ancients and moderns.—His indifference to his own works [Cf. the letter to Boileau, dated April 4, 1696]. "For a long time past God has graciously permitted that the good or evil that may be said of my tragedies scarcely moves me, and I am only troubled by the account of them I shall one day have to render Him."—He enters into closer relations with the Port-Royal; and it is doubtless for this reason that he forfeits the king's favour [Cf. Louis Racine, *Mémoires sur la vie de son père*].—His death, April 21, 1699.

5. **The Works.**—It may properly be said of the works of Racine

Would not the statement apply rather to the ideas of Locke or Grotius? Besides, what would be the explanation of the resistance, of the opposition encountered in France itself by Molière, Boileau, Racine and their fellows,—opposition over which, I repeat, they would not have triumphed but for the personal intervention of Louis XIV.? But it is especially necessary to remark that the "century of Louis XIV." scarcely lasted for more than twenty-five years, which is short

that apart from his youthful poems and a few epigrams;—all, or almost all of which are extremely biting and malicious;—they are confined to his eleven tragedies and to his comedy, *Les Plaideurs.*

The principal editions are:—the edition of 1697, Paris, Barbin, which it is in nowise certain was revised by Racine himself; the edition of 1743, Amsterdam, J. L. Bernard, with Abbé d'Olivet's observations; the edition of 1807, 7 vols. in 8vo, with Laharpe's commentary, Paris, Agasse;—the edition of 1808, also in 7 vols., with Geoffroy's commentary, Paris, Lenormand;—Aimé Martin's series of editions, 1820, 1822, 1825, 1844, Lefèvre;—P. Mesnard's edition in the "Grands Ecrivains de France" series, Paris, 1865–1873, Hachette.

VI.—**Louis Bourdaloue** [Bourges, 1632; † 1704, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Mme de Pringy, *Eloge du P. Bourdaloue* in the *Mercure galant*, June, 1704;—Abbé Lambert, *Histoire littéraire du règne de Louis XIV.*, 1751, vol. i.;—Maury, *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire*, 1777.

Vinet, *Bourdaloue* in the *Semeur*, 1843, and in his *Mélanges*;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix.;—J. J. Weiss, *Bourdaloue* in the *Revue des cours littéraires*, September, 1866;—Abbé Hurel, *Les prédicateurs sacrés à la cour de Louis XIV.*, Paris, 1872;—A. Feugère, *Bourdaloue, sa prédication et son temps*, Paris, 1874;—Father Lauras, S.J., *Bourdaloue, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1881;—Abbé Blampignon, *Etude sur Bourdaloue* preceding his *Choix de Sermons du P. Bourdaloue*, Paris, 1886;—H. Chérot, S.J., *Bourdaloue inconnu*, in *Études Religieuses*, Paris, 1898.

Louis Veuillot, *Molière et Bourdaloue.*

2. The Orator.—Absence of information respecting his early years;

measure for a century, if only the number of years be considered, but the period will seem longer when it is borne in mind that there was not one of these twenty-five years that was not rendered illustrious by the appearance of a masterpiece. We have no sooner climbed one side of the hill, than we have to descend the other; and why should we complain of this necessity, if life and movement be one and the same thing?

The truth is, the Treaty of Nimeguen in 1678, which

—and absolute uneventfulness of his life;—sincerity of his vocation;—simplicity of his existence;—and unity of his work.—His first appearance in the Paris pulpits, 1669;—and as to Voltaire's remark that "Bossuet ceased to be accounted the first among the preachers from the moment that Bourdaloue appeared."—Bourdaloue at court;—the *Advents* of 1670, '84, '86, '89, '91, '93, '97 and the *Lents* of 1672, '74, '76, '80, '82, '95.—Bourdaloue's prodigious success [Cf. the letters of Mme de Sévigné *passim* and the *Journal de Dangeau*].—Should this success be attributed to the exclusively moral and seldom dogmatic character of his preaching?—Nisard's exaggeration on this point.—Does the cause of Bourdaloue's success lie in the "portraits" or "allusions" his sermons may contain?—Difficulty of answering this question.—We do not possess the sermons Bourdaloue really delivered;—but his sermons touched up, recast, and several of them amalgamated into one.—The "portraits" of Pascal, in the *Sermon sur la médisance*;—and of Arnauld, in the *Sermon sur le sévérité chrétienne*;—and are they really "portraits"? Bourdaloue's "outspokenness"—and that it does not seem to have surpassed the degree of outspokenness customary at the time in the pulpit.—The explanation of Bourdaloue's success must be sought elsewhere;—and is easily found:

A. *In the richness of his oratorical invention.*—Diversity of the plans of Bourdaloue's sermons, and, in this connection, of the four sermons for All-Saints Day,—or of the three sermons: *sur la Crainte de la Mort,—sur la Preparation à la Mort,—sur la Pensée de la Mort.*—Peculiar beauty of this last sermon.—Severity of Bourdaloue's method;—and, in this connection, of Fénelon's paradox in his *Dialogues sur l'éloquence.*—That it is as puerile to find fault with a sermon because it is divided as a rule into three parts, as to take objection to a tragedy because it is in five acts;—that Bourdaloue, seems to mark the zenith of the power of Louis XIV., marks in reality the beginning of its decline. The gallantry of the opening of the reign had degenerated into a public scandal, against which the preachers had inveighed in vain from the pulpit! Louis XIV. had persisted in preferring the teaching of Molière to that of Bourdaloue:

> Un partage avec Jupiter
> N'a rien du tout qui déshonore . . .

moreover, was of opinion, that it is unseemly to seek to pose as a "wit" in the pulpit;—and that it is impossible to go too far in the matter of subdividing, distinguishing, and insisting, when the orator's chief preoccupation is, as was his case, to instruct and to "moralise."—The transitions in Bourdaloue's sermons;—and, more generally, of the importance of transitions in the art of oratory;—as serving as a "means of intercommunication" between the ideas expounded;—to establish their natural gradation;—and as a means of passing from them to kindred ideas.—Of the superlative and in particular of the sustained clearness,—which these qualities lend Bourdaloue's sermons;—and the primary cause of his success must be attributed to this characteristic.—Another cause lies:

B. *In the practical character of his preaching.*—Bourdaloue's sermons are of the class in which precise rules of conduct abound.—[Cf. the sermons *sur les Devoirs des pères,—sur le Soin des domestiques,—sur les Divertissements du monde,—sur la Restitution.*]—He is not content with setting forth what people should not do;—but he points out what they ought to do;—his instructions are concrete and his advice is definite.—The way in which Bourdaloue goes for his inspiration to current events [Cf. the sermon *sur l'Impureté*].—Contemporary polemics in Bourdaloue's sermons [Cf. the sermons *sur le Sévérité chrétienne*, directed against Jansenism;—*sur l'Obéissance due à l'Eglise*, against Gallicanism;—*sur l'Hypocrisie*, against Molière and *Tartuffe*].—A last cause of Bourdaloue's success lies:

C. *In the nature of his eloquence and of his style.*—Bourdaloue is the French preacher whose eloquence is most sustained.—By which is meant:—that he throws an equal light upon every part of his subject;—that the ordinary flow of his eloquence is ample rather than varied;—and that he seldom makes points or indulges in passages of exceptional brilliance.—Simplicity of Bourdaloue's style.—His disdain for all

Excess of power or its intoxication, now induce him to engage in enterprises that are beyond his strength. His haughtiness and self-sufficiency, untempered henceforth by the least familiarity, and congealed, as it were, in a perpetually solemn attitude; his abuses of power; his "chambres de réunion," his great quarrel with the Court of Rome, and the repeal of the Edict of Nantes; his intervention in English affairs and the brutal and despotic policy of Louvois;—all these things

rhetoric,—and whether he did not go to extremes in this direction?—That the manner of the man who has been rightly called "the living refutation of the *Provinciales*," is the most Jansenist there is;—after that of Nicole;—and that this very manner stood him in good stead at the time.—That it is too exact or too reasonable a manner for the taste of the present day;—but we must not on this account be blind to the subtlety,—the depth,—and the breadth of his psychology.—Comparison, in this connection, between Nicole's *Essais* and Bourdaloue's *Sermons*.—Mme de Sévigné's equal admiration for both.—That all these reasons for Bourdaloue's success as a preacher of sermons, explain his inferiority when he essays funeral orations, panegyrics, or when he preaches upon the mysteries of religion.

On the other hand and for the same reasons,—Bourdaloue is the real master among Frenchmen of the art of handling a subject oratorically;—admitting him to have had no superior in the art of setting forth, subdividing, and arranging a subject;—of treating it according to its nature;—and of refraining from introducing into it any extraneous or superfluous matter.—This absolute sincerity does no less honour to his character than to his talent,—or rather his talent and his character form an inseparable whole.—The appreciation he received at the hands of his contemporaries [Cf. Lauras, S.J., *Bourdaloue, sa vie et ses œuvres*];—of all those who discussed him;—both Catholics and Protestants.

3. The Works.—Bourdaloue's works are confined to his sermons; to fragments of his sermons, collected by his editors under the title of *Pensées*;—and of a very small number of letters.

The original edition of the sermons or works of Bourdaloue, certainly prepared in part by himself, but issued by his colleague, Father Bretonneau, appeared from 1707 to 1734, Rigaud, director of the Royal Printing Works, being the publisher. It comprises:—for the Advent estrange, alarm, and irritate the opinion, and turn against him the arms of the whole of Europe. Infatuated, too, as he is with his own parts, he chooses the moment when he has no longer a Colbert to administer his finances, a Turenne, a Condé or a Luxembourg to lead his armies, a Lionne or a Pomponne to inspire his diplomacy, he chooses this moment to embark rashly on the war, which is destined to end in the fatal treaty of Utrecht.

sermons, one volume, 1707;—Lenten sermons, three volumes, 1707; *Mystères*, two volumes, 1709;—*Sermons de vêture*, *Panégyriques*, *Oraisons funèbres*, two volumes, 1711;—*Domincales*, three volumes, 1716;—and finally *Instructions chrétiennes*, *Exhortations de retraite* or *Pensées diverses*, five volumes, 1721–1734.

The best modern editions are:—the edition of 1822–1826, Paris;—and Guérin's edition, 1864, Bar-le-Duc.

VII.—**Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux** [Paris, 1636; † 1711, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.[1]—Desmaizeaux, *Le vie de M. Despréaux*: Amsterdam, 1712;—Louis Racine, *Mémoires sur la vie de son père*, 1747; this work is printed too in a number of editions of Racine;—Cizeron Rival, *Lettres familières de MM. Boileau-Despréaux et Brossette*, Lyons, 1770;—d'Alembert, *Eloge de Despréaux*, in his collected *Éloges académiques*, Paris, 1779;—Berriat Saint-Prix, *Essai sur Boileau*, Paris, 1830.

Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i.;—*Port-Royal*, bk. vi., ch. vii.; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vi.;—Philarète Chasles, *Les Victimes de Boileau*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June and August, 1839;—F. Brunetière, article BOILEAU in the *Grande Encyclopédie*, 1887; notice preceding the *Œuvres poétiques de Boileau;* 1889; and *L'évolution des genres*, vol. i., 1890;—P. Morillot, *Boileau* in the "Classiques populaires" series, 1891;—Lanson, *Boileau* in the "Grands Ecrivains francais" series, 1892.

Delaporte, S. J., *L'art poétique de Boileau commenté par ses contemporains*, Lille, 1888.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Boileau's birth and early years;—the legal profession in 1640;—Boileau's "theological studies";—his

---

[1] Consult, too, the biographical notices printed at the beginning of the first volume of Berriat Saint-Prix' edition, Paris, 1830, Langlois and Delaunay.

Simultaneously the situation becomes gloomy at home. The tragic and scandalous affair of the poisons suddenly lays bare unfathomable depths of ignominy [Cf. Ravaisson, *Archives de la Bastille*, vols. iv., v., vi., vii., Paris, 1870–1875]. While the immense majority of Frenchmen unhappily regard with approval the repeal of the Edict of Nantes, commerce and industry are sapped and the foundations of public morality are shaken by this wholesale expulsion of the Protestants. The character of the court itself under-

legal studies;—his early writings;—the writing of the first *Satires*, 1660, 1661;—the *Stances pour l'École des femmes*, 1662.—Boileau's friendship with Molière, La Fontaine and Racine.—The *Mouton blanc* tavern once more!—The *Dissertation sur Joconde*.—Readings of the *Satires* in society.—The collection printed in Holland, 1665.—Boileau decides to print his writings, 1666.—Emotion caused by the first *Satires* [I., VI., VII., II., IV., III., V.]—particularly in the "precious society."—Cotin replies to them: *La satyre des satyres*, 1666,—also Boursault, 1669.—Their scurrilous violence.—Boileau's courage and perseverance.—The *Discours sur la Satire*, 1668.—Coalition of Boileau's enemies.—Chapelain and Perrault prevent his being inscribed on "the list of the King's bounties,"—and endeavour to prevent his obtaining the authorisation to print his works;—while M. de Montausier threatens him with personal violence.—The *Épître au Roi*;—Boileau has it presented the King by Mme de Montespan;—and, in this connection, of the services rendered men of letters by Mme de Montespan,—services which explain, though they do not excuse, the flattery bestowed on her by all or almost all contemporary men of letters.—Could they be more prudish than Vivonne, the lady's brother?—and living as they did [Cf. Mme de Sévigné's letters, 1671];—are we to accuse them of baseness?—Publication of the first *Épitres*;—of the *Art poétique*; and of the first cantos of the *Lutrin*, 1674.—Boileau figures for the first time on the "list of the King's bounties" in 1676;—he is appointed "to write the history of the King," 1677;—and he renounces "the profession of poetry."

A. *Boileau as a Critic*.—The great merit of Boileau's criticism is:—that it turned away the reading public from the Chapelains and Scarrons;—that it may almost be said to have revealed Molière [Cf. the *Stances sur l'École des femmes*];—La Fontaine [Cf. the *Dissertation sur Joconde*];—Racine [Cf. the *Dialogue sur les héros de* goes a change. La Vallière expiates her passion in the austere seclusion of a cloister; Fontanges is dead, "stricken in the king's service"; Mme de Montespan has had to retire from court; and in their stead reigns Mme de Maintenon, who occupies an ill-defined situation, partaking at once of that of a mistress, a housekeeper, and a governess. "Such is the state in which things were in 1690, an eyewitness tells us, Ezéchiel Spanheim, the Brandenburg envoy, and in which they still are so

roman].—He revealed these writers to themselves as well as to the public;—and enforced admiration for them.—The hatreds naturally engendered by this manner of conceiving satire;—and how Boileau held his own against them;—without any protection except his honesty [Cf. *Discours sur la satire* and *Satire* IX.].—Boileau's moral superiority [Cf. *Satires* I., V., VIII. and *Épîtres* III., V., VI.] over the majority of his adversaries;—and over two at least of his illustrious friends.—The absolute independence of his situation, humour, and taste;—his freedom of judgment [Cf. *Satire* V., on the nobility, and *Épîtres* VIII. and IX.],—and that it was far greater than might be thought at first sight.—Fruitfulness of his criticism,—and, in this connection, whether the "criticism of faults" may not help to an appreciation of the contrary qualities.—Of the personal influence Boileau may have exerted on Molière;—on La Fontaine;—on Racine;—and of an opinion of Sainte-Beuve on this subject.—Of the *Art poétique*;—and how it forms a continuation of Boileau's "critical" work [Cf. in particular, canto iii.].—The "rules" laid down in it are at once a eulogy of Virgil and a satire on the *Pucelle* from a literary point of view;—while the "rules" it gives for tragedy constitute at once an apology for the tragedy of Racine and a criticism of that of Corneille.—In the same way the *Lutrin* is the criticism in action of the *Virgile travesti*.—How a doctrine grew naturally out of this criticism;—and what is this doctrine?

B. *Boileau's doctrine*.—That its starting-point is the imitation of nature:

Nature must never be departed from;—

and hence, as in Molière's comedy, the condemnation alike of burlesque;—and of preciosity.—Novelty of the advice at the time it was given, since it was so many years since anybody had proffered it;—

far as is known—a state of things which, at the finish, of a woman of undistinguished birth, old, poor, the widow of a writer of burlesque, an attendant on the mistress of the king, *whose court, too, is the most gallant in Europe*, has made of this woman the confidant, the mistress and it is even believed the wife of a great monarch" [Cf. Ezéchiel Spanheim, *Relation de la Cour de France en 1690*, Paris, 1882]. Whether wife or mistress, the aged woman esteems that the only way to in-

with the sole exception of Pascal.—The way, however, in which the general principle of the imitation of nature suffers restrictions in Boileau's doctrine;—owing to his indifference as a citizen of Paris to external nature;—to his taste, derived from his contemporaries, for purely moral observation;—and by the exigencies of the current politeness:

> Never touch upon what is low.

Of the usefulness of these restrictions;—and of their dangers;—of which the most considerable is to reduce the imitation of nature to the imitation of what all men have in common;—and in consequence to reduce nature itself to what is most abstract in nature.—How Boileau, who was fully alive to this danger, essayed to avoid it;—by giving to style the importance he has accorded it:

> In this dangerous art of rhyming and writing
> There is no intermediary stage between the mediocre and the bad,

and by recommending the imitation of the ancients;—whose works in his eyes are not only models;—but are the treasure store as well of the accumulated experience of men;—and are so much evidence of the identity of human nature beneath all its outward variations.—How Boileau's doctrine is completed by a moral side;—and how much loftier his morality is than of the other men of letters of his time.

C. *Boileau's Polemics against the Moderns.*—Of the usefulness of polemics as obliging us to look clearly into our own ideas.—The translation of the *Traité du sublime*, 1674;—and the *Réflexions critiques sur Longin*, 1694.—Whether Boileau's admiration for the ancients was not almost superstitious?—and what did he imagine was "Pindaric" about his *Ode sur la prise de Namur*, 1693? [Cf. his *Discours sur l'Ode*].—That in any case the quarrel obliged Boileau to revise his principles;—and that while he did not abandon them;—he sure the duration and the condonation of her extraordinary fortune is to affect to be pious and a prude. *Altri tempi, altre cure!* Her chief concern is for the king's salvation. He is governed by her, and she is governed in turn by Nanon her servant. The glorious period of the reign is over. After Ryswick and the Savoy marriage, the vivacious Duchess of Burgundy is scarcely successful in bringing about some semblance of a revival of the splen-

extended the range of their consequences;—and better defined their application.—The *Septième réflexion sur Longin*, 1694.—Of the distinction which Boileau admits should be made between Lycophron and Homer;—and of the importance of this distinction;—seeing that Ronsard and Corneille put all the ancients in the same category.—That he made yet another step in advance;—when he determined the "historical conditions" on which the perfection of literary works depend;—and he was the first to make these conditions lie in the juncture or coinciding of the arrival at perfection of the literary branches with the arrival at maturity of the language.—Boileau's last works: the three last *Epîtres*, 1695;—the preface to the edition of 1701, containing the letter to M. Perrault;—and the three last *Satires*, 1694, 1698, and 1705.

Of Boileau as a poet,—or rather as a writer;—his admissions on this head [Cf. *Satires* II. *à M. de Molière*, and XII. *l'Equivoque* and *Epîtres* VI. and X.].—Would one suspect in reading him the close relationship between Satire and Lyricism?—How much narrower and above all how much less daring his art is than his criticism.—The qualities he lacks are those in which Molière is too often deficient;—elevation, distinction, and grace;—and these are not only among the essential qualities of a poet;—they are also the qualities upon which depend "aristocracy" of style:—and, in this connection, that this enemy of the Précieuses might have learnt more than one useful lesson from them.—On the other hand, and as was the case with Molière, he possesses all the "middle-class" qualities,—and in the first place, and within the limits of his horizon, the sense of the picturesque side of reality,—[Cf. *Le repas ridicule*, the *Satire des femmes*, the four first cantos of the *Lutrin*];—he has humour, too, humour of no very lofty order but often biting;—and finally he possesses in a high degree the gift of rendering his thoughts with the expressive brevity of the proverb;—a gift which consists in the ability to find a "handy" form of expression for common experiences.—The dour that has vanished beyond recall. The king may still be alive, but the reign is at an end though he live for ten, fifteen, or twenty years! The laughter and the pleasure are things of the past, and in their place reigns a gloomy sadness. And little by little a thick, lugubrious atmosphere of boredom settles down over all that remains of what was once "the most gallant court in Europe."

same qualities and the same defects are to be found in his prose [Cf. his correspondence, the *Discours sur la Satire* and his prefaces]—accompanied by less restraint;—and by a certain impressionableness and off-handedness;—which exactly reflect his character;—and which do him honour.

3. THE WORKS.—The poetical works of Boileau comprise:—his *Satires*, of which there are twelve;—his *Epîtres*, also twelve in number;—his *Art poétique*, in four cantos;—his *Lutrin*, in six cantos;—and finally some miscellaneous poems including the *Ode sur la prise de Namur* and a certain number of epigrams.

His prose works comprise:—the *Dissertation sur Joconde* and the *Dialogue sur les héros de roman*, which he did not publish himself; his translation of the *Traité du sublime*; his *Réflexions critiques sur Longin*;—the prefaces to the different editions of his works, 1666, 1674, 1675, 1683, 1685, 1694, 1701;—and an entire volume of letters of which the most interesting are those addressed to Racine and to Brossette.

The early editions of the *Satires*, and in particular that of 1666, contain a considerable number of passages which were suppressed, transposed, or modified in the succeeding editions. And it is doubtless interesting to know that the first edition of the *Satire des femmes*, which is that of 1693, did not contain the famous portrait of the criminal lieutenant Tardieu:

> Mais pour mieux mettre ici leur crasse en tout son lustre . . .

Boileau having deleted it on the advice of Racine. In a general way, however, the editions that furnish the standard text are nevertheless that of 1701, and in a certain measure that of 1713, which there is reason to believe he prepared for the press himself.

The best posthumous editions are: Saint-Marc's edition, Paris, 1747, five volumes;—Berriat Saint-Prix' edition, Paris, 1830;—and Gidel's edition, Paris, 1880.

III

Beyond the pale of the court, however, the formation of fresh coteries is soon in progress. Molière is dead and Racine converted. Boileau, charged with writing the history of the royal campaigns, is overjoyed "at being engaged, as he says, on the glorious task, which has released him from the poetical profession": and thus engaged he is silent. The victims these writers thought they had slain return at once to life: with smirk and bow the adepts of preciosity reappear on the scene. Mme Deshoulières rallies them around her, and under her protection

> Pradon and his crew dare to write verse and go unpunished!

Sixth Period

From the cabal organised against "Phèdre" to the issue of the "Lettres Persanes"

1677–1722

I.—The beginnings of French Opera.

1. The Sources.—Goujet, *Bibliothèque française*, articles, Benserade and Quinault;—Chauffepié, *Dictionnaire*, article Quinault;—Titon du Tillet, *Parnasse français*, articles Quinault and Lully;—Grimm, in the *Encyclopédie*, article Poème lyrique;—the life of Quinault preceding the edition of his works, Paris, 1778;—Léris, *Dictionnaire des Théâtres*.

Nuitter and Thoinan, *Les origines de l'Opéra français*, Paris, 1886;—Romain Rolland, *Histoire de l'Opéra en Europe*, Paris, 1895.

2. The Conflict between Opera and Drama.—The triumph of tragedy and comedy, the pure species, did not entirely do away with the hybrid species: tragi-comedy, the pastoral, and the ballet.—Spectacular plays: *Andromède*, 1650, and the *Toison d'or* by Corneille;—Isaac de Benserade and his ballets;—Molière's ballet-comedies: *La princesse d'Elide*, 1664; *Mélicerte*, 1666; *Psyché*, 1671.

Jesuits join in, and now give lessons in taste as they used to give lessons in morality. Criticism is overrun with professors. Father Bouhours publishes his "dialogues on the art of thinking aright as applied to literature." He teaches in them that it is incumbent on an author to imitate nature. Unfortunately, he cites the following quotation as a specimen of a perfectly natural thought: "The actions of princes resemble mighty rivers of which few have seen the source, but of which all men see the course." Father Rapin, his colleague, when not engaged on his history of Jansenism, discusses with Bussy the question "whether a man should address his mistress in the second person singular?": doubtless the question is merely one of style, but to Pascal it would indeed have seemed a "pretty" question. In the meanwhile Quinault

—Analogy between all these essays, and that their object was:—to procure the eye satisfactions which tragedy did not furnish:—to turn to account the fables of mythology;—and to set free the musical element that is contained in all "poetry."—The foundation of the Academy of Music, 1669,—and the first French opera: *Pomone*, 1671. —Jean-Baptiste Lully [Cf. the *Mémoires* of Mme de Montpensier].—His collaboration with Molière,—and with Quinault.—Their first operas: *Cadmus et Hermione*, 1673;—*Alceste*, 1674;—*Thésée*, 1675; *Atys*, 1676;—*Isis*, 1677.

Quinault's remarkable talent for opera;—Voltaire's pompous eulogy of him;—and that of Quinault and Lully it was the former who during a hundred and fifty years was accounted "the great man."—Pleasing frivolity of Quinault's imagination;—his fluent style;—and, in this connection, of the frequent recurrence in his verses of comparisons drawn from "liquids";—his constant desire to please;—and wishing to please, his avoidance of the more profound aspects of passion.—Of the "commonplaces of licentious morality" in Quinault's operas.

How the success of the opera influenced the direction taken by the evolution of the drama.—The triumphs of Quinault undoubtedly aroused the jealousy of Racine;—and what is worse, his emulation.—Of the evidence there is in *Phèdre* of an intention on the part of Racine to vie with Quinault [Cf. *Les époques du théâtre français*].—That Racine's retirement favoured the development of opera.—

is triumphant; the success of his *Atys*, his *Persée*, or his *Armide* is his vengeance for the onslaughts of the author of the *Satires*; while half a dozen opera librettos refurbish his reputation so entirely that Voltaire, eighty years later, will be led astray by its brilliancy. There is an active production of novels of the stamp of the *Histoire amoureuse des Gaules*, the work of pamphleteers of the calibre of Courtilz de Sandras, the author of the *Mémoires de Rochefort* and of the *Trois Mousquetaires*—I mean of the *Mémoires de M. d'Artagnan*. At the same time, writers of the class of Montfleury, of Poisson, and of Dancourt, who is beginning his career, exhibit their "buffooneries" on the stage made illustrious by Molière —on the stage they have converted into a show of as base an order as "a public execution" according to

Thomas Corneille's *Psyché*, 1678;—Fontenelle's *Bellérophon*, 1679; —Quinault's *Proserpine*, 1680.—The "tragic authors" take to writing indifferently either tragedy or lyric tragedy.—Of some consequences of this practice;—and how after having influenced style in the direction of greater laxity,—it extends its influence from the style to the matter;—it enfeebles the conception of the drama;—and substitutes for the art of depicting character or the passions, the art of appealing to the sensibility.

3. THE WORKS.—Of Quinault: *Cadmus*, 1673;—*Alceste*, 1674;—*Thésée*, 1675;—*Atys*, 1676;—*Isis*, 1677;—of Fontenelle and Th. Corneille: *Psyché*, 1678;—*Bellérophon*, 1679;—of Quinault: *Proserpine*, 1680;—*Persée*, 1682;—*Phaéton*, 1683;—*Amadis*, 1684;—*Roland*, 1685;—*Armide*, 1686;—of Campistron: *Acis et Galathée*, 1686;—*Achille*, 1687;—of Fontenelle: *Thétis et Pélée*, 1687;—*Enée et Lavinie*, 1690.

II.—**Nicolas Malebranche** [Paris, 1638; † 1715, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Fontenelle, *Eloge de Malebranche*;—Tabaraud, *Biographie universelle*, article MALEBRANCHE.

Cousin, *Fragments de philosophie moderne*;—F. Bouillier, *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne*, 1854;—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, bk. vi., chap. v. and vi.;—Blampignon, *Étude sur Malebranche*, Paris, 1861;—Ollé-Laprune, *La philosophie de Malebranche*, Paris, 1870.

Racine's vigorous expression. La Fontaine, now that his former friends are dead or live apart from him, abandons himself to his natural inclinations, and almost confines himself to writing tales—and such tales, for an author who is over sixty years of age! From the other side of the Channel, Saint-Evremond, who has also grown old, encourages him in his course. At the residence of the Vendôme family in the Temple it is the custom to get royally intoxicated, and this is not the worst that passes there. The Princesses of the blood have taken to smoking pipes. Finally, to complete the parallel between the last years of the century and its opening, it is the turn of the "libertines" to reappear on the scene to which the rakes and the Précieux have returned or are returning.

Father André: *Vie du Père Malebranche*, published by Father Ingold, Paris, 1886.

2. **The Philosopher**;—and in the first place of the homage it is just to pay the writer.—Daunou's fine eulogy of the style of Malebranche;—Daunou not having forgotten that he had himself belonged to the Oratory [*Cours d'études historiques*, vi. and xx.].—Perfect simplicity;—naïveté;—eloquence;—and more particularly the ease of his style,—qualities which in his case are the more admirable owing to the abstruse nature of the topics he treats.—No French philosopher has a style that can compare with that of Malebranche.

The disciple of Descartes [Cf. his *Éloge* by Fontenelle];—and that the philosophy of Malebranche is an attempt to reconcile Christianity and Cartesianism. — Malebranche's exaggerated confidence in the power of reason,—and in its capacity to give a "natural" explanation of the inexplicable.—His optimism;—and that though he owes it directly to Descartes,—still it is more in conformity with the Christian conception of life than is the optimism of his master.—The idea of Providence in the philosophy of Malebranche;—and that it scarcely differs from the idea of Providence entertained by the Stoics of antiquity.—That all these theories tended to establish the sufficiency of "natural religion";—and it is a fact that the influence of Malebranche achieved this result, though doubtless in opposition to his wishes.

Bossuet was the only man who might perhaps have been able to cope with these invaders, to keep them in check and to overawe them: and Bossuet, it happens, though he delivered his last Funeral Orations in 1685, 1686, and 1687, preaches but rarely. On the other hand, being no longer burdened with, or at least being no longer responsible for the education of the Dauphin, it is at this very period that he is producing almost all his principal works. The date of the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* is 1681, and that of the *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes*, 1688. Of these two works, it is the first that comes in for the most praise. And yet it must be said of the second that there is no finer book in the French language, for while, like the *Provinciales*, it contains unperishable examples of every kind of noble writing, it has

The critics of Malebranche: — Arnauld, — Bossuet, — Fénelon,— Leibnitz;—a letter of Bossuet [May 21, 1687] to a disciple of Malebranche.—Fénelon refutes the *Traité de la nature et de la grâce.* —The critics of Malebranche object more particularly to his theory that the Divine action takes effect "on general lines";—since they consider this theory leads to that of the "stability of the laws of nature";—that is to the denial of the supernatural;—and at the same time to the disappearance of the possibility of miracles;—of the necessity for a revelation;—and of the utility of religion.

3. THE WORKS.—*La recherche de la vérité*, 1674–1675;—*Conversations chrétiennes*, 1676;—*Traité de la nature et de la grâce*;—*Méditations chrétiennes*, 1683;—*Traité de morale*, 1684;—*Entretiens sur la métaphysique*, 1688;—*Traité de l'amour de Dieu*, 1697;—*Réponses à M. Arnauld*, four volumes, the last of which appeared in 1709;—*Réflexions sur la prémotion physique*, 1715.

In his *Fragments de philosophie moderne*, vol. ii., Victor Cousin has published an important series of letters by Malebranche, the literary interest of which lies in their showing the philosopher in touch with Mairan and with Fontenelle and his group.

There is only one edition of the complete works of Malebranche, two volumes in 4to, Paris, 1837.

In 1871 Jules Simon published an edition of the works of Malebranche in four volumes containing the *Entretiens sur la méta-*

this advantage over Pascal's work, that it is a book in the highest sense of the word, a book of which all the parts, though distinct, form an indivisible whole, whose every page, indeed whose every line, is inspired by and helps to prove the soundness of the idea that underlies the entire fabric. Recent researches, moreover, have revealed that greater labour and greater impartiality have never been expended on the preparation of a polemical work [Cf. Rébelliau, *Bossuet historien du protestantisme*, Paris, 1891]. And why should we not add that it would be hard to cite a work of this class, whose aim is nobler or more generous, since its author's sole object in writing it was to labour for that "reunion of the Churches" which, after being the dearest dream of his youth, remained to the end of his life the most tenacious of his illusions?

physique, the *Méditations chrétiennes*, and the *Recherche de la vérité*.

III.—**Pierre Bayle** [Le Carlat (Ariège), 1647; † 1706, Rotterdam].

1. THE SOURCES.—*Calendarium Carlananum*, 1660–1687, and Bayle's correspondence;—Desmaizeaux, *Vie de M. P. Bayle*, 1730, found in the last editions of the *Dictionnaire* and in vol. xvi. of Beuchot's edition;—Abbé Marsy, *Analyse raisonnée des œuvres de Bayle*, 1755;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i., 1835;—L. Feuerbach, *Pierre Bayle, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Menschheit*, Leipsic, 1838 and 1848;—Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la philosophie en France au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1846;—A. Sayous, *La littérature française à l'étranger*, Paris and Geneva, vol. i., 1853;—Lenient, *Étude sur Bayle*, Paris, 1855;—Arsène Deschamps, *La genèse du scepticisme érudit chez Bayle*, Brussels, 1878;—Emile Gigas, *Choix de la correspondance inédite de Pierre Bayle*, Copenhagen, 1890;—F. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, 5th series, Paris, 1893;—Ch. Renouvier, *Philosophie analytique de l'histoire*, v. iii., Paris, 1897.

2. THE CRITICISM OF BAYLE.

A. *The early years and the first efforts of Bayle.*—He came of a Protestant stock; his studies at Puylaurens and at Toulouse, 1666–1669;—he is converted to Catholicism, 1669;—he is reconverted to

The *Avertissements aux Protestants,* which complete and strengthen the *Histoire des variations,* were written between 1689 and 1691. But the "reunion" was not destined to be accomplished, nor was Bossuet, in spite of his eloquence and his masterly dialectics, to be successful to any notable extent in stemming the progress of "libertinism."

If he failed, however, it was not because he was blind to this progress, as is proved sufficiently by the many passages that might be quoted from his works [Cf. in particular the *Sermon sur la divinité de la religion,* 1665; the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle,* part ii., 1681; and the *Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague,* 1685]. From the very first he was fully alive to the tendencies of the exegesis of Richard Simon, and yet to divine them

Protestantism, 1670;—his departure for Geneva and his tutorships:—in the family of M. de Normandie;—in that of the Comte de Dhona;—his return to France, 1647.—Bayle professor of philosophy at the Protestant Academy of Sedan, 1675–1681 [Cf. his *Cursus philosophiæ,* and Bourchenin *Les académies Protestantes*].—Suppression of the Sedan academy.—Bayle takes up his residence at Rotterdam, 1681,—where he holds the post of unattached professor of philosophy, in the pay of the town.—Publication of the *Pensées sur la comète,* 1682,—and of the *Critique générale de l'histoire du Calvinisme du Père Maimbourg.*—Singular character of these two works;—the style of which is behind,—and the ideas of which are in advance of those of his contemporaries by thirty or forty years.—Bayle embarks upon the publication of the *Nouvelles de la République des lettres,* 1684.—It is a paper or a magazine, and Bayle must not for a moment be judged by it:—"I did not exercise the functions of a critic in this publication, he has himself declared, "merely noting in the books what was of a nature to call attention to them."—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.—Bayle publishes his two pamphlets: *Ce que c'est que la France toute catholique sous le règne de Louis le Grand,* 1686; and the *Commentaire philosophique sur le Compelle intrare,* 1686;—indignation of the Protestant party, and of Jurien in particular.—Bossuet's adversary is equally the adversary of Bayle;—whom he bitterly reproaches with "preaching the dogma of reliso early as 1678 was none too easy. Again, as early as 1687, he foresaw what he himself spoke of as "the great attack, which, under the name of Cartesianism, was preparing against the Church." He was as little mistaken in his opinion that, if the progress of libertinism were to be resisted efficaciously, a beginning must be made by reuniting in a single body the scattered elements of the Church; for both time and the admissions of orthodox Protestantism have borne out the correctness of his views on this point. Under these circumstances, what were the reasons of his failure? The first was that the Protestants, encouraged at the time by their successes in the war which followed the formation of the League of Augsburg, believed they would profit by all the losses that might be sustained by Catholicism, an opinion that

gious indifference and universal tolerance."—Bayle conceals his authorship of the book;—himself makes ironical allusions to it in his *Lettres*;—complains in his *Nouvelles* of its being ascribed to him;—and thus sets the example of those rather dishonourable tactics, which will be adopted by Voltaire.—He has the "courage of his opinions," but he is afraid of their consequences.—The *Avis aux réfugiés*, 1690;—and whether Bayle is its author [Cf. Sayous, *Littérature française a l'étranger*]? — Interest of the question. — The discussion between Bayle and Jurien grows more and more bitter. — Jurien accuses him of atheism; — in support of Jurien's accusation the "Protestant ministers" call attention to certain characteristic passages in the *Pensées sur la comète*;— the Rotterdam magistrates deprive Bayle of his pension;—and cancel his authorisation to teach. — Curious passage in one of Bayle's letters [December 28, 1693], — which goes to show that the hostility he had excited was more especially due to his being a Cartesian:—"The Rotterdam ministers . . . he says, are obstinate admirers of Aristotle, whom they do not understand, and they cannot hear Descartes spoken of without falling into a rage."

B. The *Dictionnaire historique et critique*.—The original scheme of the *Dictionnaire* [Cf. the scheme of 1692];—and that the work was intended to be one of pure erudition;—having for its sole object to trace and to rectify the errors in the other dictionaries.—The

The *Avertissements aux Protestants*, which complete and strengthen the *Histoire des variations*, were written between 1689 and 1691. But the "reunion" was not destined to be accomplished, nor was Bossuet, in spite of his eloquence and his masterly dialectics, to be successful to any notable extent in stemming the progress of "libertinism."

If he failed, however, it was not because he was blind to this progress, as is proved sufficiently by the many passages that might be quoted from his works [Cf. in particular the *Sermon sur la divinité de la religion*, 1665; the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, part ii., 1681; and the *Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague*, 1685]. From the very first he was fully alive to the tendencies of the exegesis of Richard Simon, and yet to divine them

---

Protestantism, 1670;—his departure for Geneva and his tutorships:—in the family of M. de Normandie;—in that of the Comte de Dhona;—his return to France, 1647.—Bayle professor of philosophy at the Protestant Academy of Sedan, 1675–1681 [Cf. his *Cursus philosophiæ*, and Bourchenin *Les académies Protestantes*].—Suppression of the Sedan academy.—Bayle takes up his residence at Rotterdam, 1681,—where he holds the post of unattached professor of philosophy, in the pay of the town.—Publication of the *Pensées sur la comète*, 1682,—and of the *Critique générale de l'histoire du Calvinisme du Père Maimbourg*.—Singular character of these two works;—the style of which is behind,—and the ideas of which are in advance of those of his contemporaries by thirty or forty years.—Bayle embarks upon the publication of the *Nouvelles de la République des lettres*, 1684.—It is a paper or a magazine, and Bayle must not for a moment be judged by it:—"I did not exercise the functions of a critic in this publication, he has himself declared, "merely noting in the books what was of a nature to call attention to them."—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.—Bayle publishes his two pamphlets: *Ce que c'est que la France toute catholique sous le règne de Louis le Grand*, 1686; and the *Commentaire philosophique sur le Compelle intrare*, 1686;—indignation of the Protestant party, and of Jurien in particular.—Bossuet's adversary is equally the adversary of Bayle;—whom he bitterly reproaches with "preaching the dogma of reliso early as 1678 was none too easy. Again, as early as 1687, he foresaw what he himself spoke of as "the great attack, which, under the name of Cartesianism, was preparing against the Church." He was as little mistaken in his opinion that, if the progress of libertinism were to be resisted efficaciously, a beginning must be made by reuniting in a single body the scattered elements of the Church; for both time and the admissions of orthodox Protestantism have borne out the correctness of his views on this point. Under these circumstances, what were the reasons of his failure? The first was that the Protestants, encouraged at the time by their successes in the war which followed the formation of the League of Augsburg, believed they would profit by all the losses that might be sustained by Catholicism, an opinion that

gious indifference and universal tolerance."—Bayle conceals his authorship of the book;—himself makes ironical allusions to it in his *Lettres*;—complains in his *Nouvelles* of its being ascribed to him;—and thus sets the example of those rather dishonourable tactics, which will be adopted by Voltaire.—He has the "courage of his opinions," but he is afraid of their consequences.—The *Avis aux réfugiés*, 1690;—and whether Bayle is its author [Cf. Sayous, *Littérature française a l'étranger*]? — Interest of the question. — The discussion between Bayle and Jurien grows more and more bitter. — Jurien accuses him of atheism; — in support of Jurien's accusation the "Protestant ministers" call attention to certain characteristic passages in the *Pensées sur la comète*;—the Rotterdam magistrates deprive Bayle of his pension;—and cancel his authorisation to teach. — Curious passage in one of Bayle's letters [December 28, 1693], — which goes to show that the hostility he had excited was more especially due to his being a Cartesian:—"The Rotterdam ministers . . . he says, are obstinate admirers of Aristotle, whom they do not understand, and they cannot hear Descartes spoken of without falling into a rage."

B. The *Dictionnaire historique et critique*.—The original scheme of the *Dictionnaire* [Cf. the scheme of 1692];—and that the work was intended to be one of pure erudition;—having for its sole object to trace and to rectify the errors in the other dictionaries.—The was the sensation aroused by the *Relation sur le quiétisme*, and the book was literally devoured. Victory followed close on the appearance of the work, which brought about the downfall of Quietism. Still for five whole years a purely theological question, and a question too of mystical theology, had diverted Bossuet's attention from a matter which, perhaps, was of greater urgency. Once again, moreover, public opinion had taken but a languid interest in a quarrel, the violence of which it found so incomprehensible, that it had sought an explanation in reasons that were little to the honour of either of the combatants. "I assure you," wrote the Princess Palatine, "that this quarrel between bishops turns on anything rather than on matters of faith."

Rotterdam consistory;—and to justify himself he writes his four dissertations on "Atheists";—on the "Manicheans";—on "Obscenities";—and on the "Pyrrhonians."—Remarks, in this connection, on the subjects of "Protestant tolerance" and "liberty in Holland." The *Réponses aux questions d'un provincial*, 1703; — and the *Continuation des Pensées sur la comète*, 1704.—The theory of the incompetency of universal consent;—and the chapter: "It is in nowise sure that the impressions left by nature are to be accepted as the expression of the truth" [Cf. *Continuation*, ch. 23 and 24].—Death of Bayle:—Perfect dignity of his life.—His disinterestedness. His only vices were intellectual vices;—and with Spinoza;—although his existence was less noble than Spinoza's;—he was one of the first writers whose intellectual libertinism was not prompted by moral libertinism.—Importance of this fact [Cf. Bossuet's and Bourdaloue's attacks on the libertines];—and how greatly it contributed to the propagation of Bayle's philosophical ideas.

3. THE WORKS.—We have enumerated Bayle's principal works, and there only remains to mention in addition a voluminous and interesting correspondence.

The best edition of his Works is the great edition of 1727, 1731 in 4 folio vols, the Hague, published by Husson, Johnson, Gosse, &c. [the reprint of this edition of 1737 contains about 150 additional letters]; the best edition of the *Dictionnaire* is that of 1720, also in 4 vols., Rotterdam, published by Michel Bohm.

She quoted the epigram:

In these conflicts in which our French prelates
Appear to seek the truth,
One declares it is hope that is being destroyed,
The other that it is charity.
But it is faith that is being destroyed without anybody giving the matter a thought.

And under cover of this controversy it was libertinism that was making giant strides in proportion as religion lost its prestige and authority.

For while "the secret of the sanctuary" [Cf. Diderot, *Apologie pour l'abbé de Prades*] was being betrayed, as it seemed, in this way, Cartesianism was biding its time, was merely awaiting an opportunity to enter the citadel.

In 1820 Beuchot published an edition of the *Dictionnaire* in sixteen volumes, enriched with the commentaries or remarks of all the notable students of the author, Prosper Marchand, Chaufepié, Leclerc, Joli, &c.

It cannot be too much regretted that there are no modern editions of the Works, not even of the famous *Avis aux réfugiés* or of the *Pensées sur la comète*.

IV.—**Bernard le Bouvier de Fontenelle** [Rouen, 1657; † 1757, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire* February, 1757;—Abbé Trublet, *Mémoires pour servir á l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de M. de Fontenelle*, 2nd edit. Paris, 1761;—Villenave's Notice preceding his edition of Fontenelle's works, Paris, 1818;—Garat, *Mémoires sur la vie de M. Suard*, Paris, 1820; Flourens, *Fontenelle ou de la philosophie moderne*, Paris, 1847; Sainte-Beuve, *Fontenelle* in the *Causeries du lundi*, vol. iii.;—J. Bertrand, *L'Académie des sciences de 1666 à 1793*, Paris, 1869.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—The *Cydias* of La Bruyère,—that La Bruyère's experience of life was insufficient to allow of his knowing and appreciating the real Fontenelle.—Fontenelle's universality;—he is the author of tragedies, eclogues, operas, and comedies;—and of dissertations, dialogues, novels and of works that are of the nature of works of history and criticism.—His characteristic trait is that he

It may be that this Cartesianism was a degenerate form of the true doctrine of Descartes, but it was a logical Cartesianism logically evolved from the philosopher's principles; and this is the moment to trace its real influence.

"Every philosophy, Sainte-Beuve has said [Cf. *Port-Royal*, bk. iv., ch. 5], whatever it be at the outset and in the mouth of its original founder, becomes anti-Christian or at least heretical with the second generation; this is a law it is essential not to overlook." An instructive example of its operation is afforded by the gentle, eloquent and candid Malebranche. A faithful and indeed a passionate disciple of Descartes, it occurs to him to form the project of applying his master's principles to

was a "man of wit";—in every sense of the word;—that is to say a man of culture, a witty man, and almost a man of great intellect;—and that he is a remarkable example of what the intellect is capable and incapable of.

A. *The Man of Culture*:—He was Corneille's nephew;—and for this reason the born enemy of Racine and Boileau;—his first literary efforts in the *Mercure galant*, 1677;—he collaborates in the operas *Psyché* and *Bellérophon*, 1678 and 1679;—his tragedy *Aspar* [Cf. Racine's epigram];—the *Dialogues des Morts*, 1683;— the *Lettres du chevalier d'Her . . .*, 1683;—and of the sort of family likeness there is between this work and Voiture's *Lettres*.—Bayle's eulogy of this book [Cf. *Nouvelles de la République des lettres*, December, 1687];—Fontenelle publishes his *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*, 1686. Success of this book and the nature of its success [Cf. Garat, *Mémoires sur M. Suard*].—Injustice of La Bruyère.—With the *Entretiens sur la pluralité* science makes its entry into literature for the first time;—and even into the conversation of society.—Fontenelle's other writings;—his *Mémoires sur le nombre 9*;—his *Doutes sur le système des causes occasionelles*;—his *Histoire des oracles*, 1687.—The way in which Fontenelle's culture enables him to procure acceptance for a number of ideas which are as daring as they are novel.—Extensiveness and diversity of the world in which his intellect moves, as compared with the narrowness of the world to which Racine and Boileau had confined themselves.

the demonstration or the development of the truths of Christianity; and now suddenly, through a rent in the veil, the essential contradiction comes into view. It is impossible to be at once a Christian and a Cartesian! it is clear in an instant that the universal determinism of the philosophers is incompatible with the conception of a divine Providence. Pascal had detected this latent antagonism, and it does not escape Bossuet, for it is at this juncture that he causes Fénelon to write his *Refutation du Traité de la nature et de la grâce,* in answer to Malebranche. Arnauld also, the great Arnauld as he is already called, is alive to the truth. "The more mindful I am that I am a Christian, writes the one, the less can I share the ideas he (Malebranche) propounds"; and

B. *The "homme d'esprit."*—New signification acquired by the word "esprit" at the time of Fontenelle;—and in the first place it conveys the idea that the man who possesses the quality it expresses is a man of wide interests.—Fontenelle is interested in very many things;—and in the essence of things [Cf. among his *Dialogues: Laure et Sapho*, *Agnès Sorel et Roxelane*, *Socrate et Montaigne*, *Anne de Bretagne et Marie Tudor*, *Brutus et Faustine*]—Secondly an "homme d'esprit" is a man who does not attach more importance to things than they deserve;—and to employ one of Fontenelle's favourite expressions he is "that man" [Cf. among his *Dialogues*: *Erasme et Charles-Quint*, *Alexandre et Phryné*, *Guillaume de Cabestan et Frédéric de Brandebourg*, *Straton et Raphaël*].—His liking for what is new [Cf. *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes*].—His independent attitude towards tradition.—Finally an "homme d'esprit" is a man who perceives the relations between things and the category to which they belong [Cf. *Histoire des oracles*];—who makes further suggestions to his readers in these connections;—pointing out relations and categories which are unexpected and remote.—That Fontenelle makes his readers think;—and that the distinguishing features of his talent are its subtlety;—and the far-reaching import of the hints he gives.

C. *Fontenelle as a great intellect*;—that it is justifiable to regard him as such merely because he applied his intelligence to the consideration of matters of great moment.—His preface to the *Histoire* in turn the second declares : "The further I progress with this work (it was a refutation of the *Traité de nature et de la grâce*) the more I am struck by the antagonism between religion and these metaphysical imaginings." But the mighty theologian has been long in perceiving this antagonism, and what is more, well equipped as he is in some respects, he labours under the disadvantage of lacking the rich, fluent, and seductive style of Malebranche. Nobody reads him, while Malebranche is read. He is confronted at last by a writer, a genuine writer, by the great writer whom up to now Cartesianism had been without. And it is a fact that Malebranche finds disciples. While Bossuet and Fénelon are wasting their energy in other conflicts, he goes on

de l'Académie des sciences, 1699.—The idea of the "solidarity of the sciences" finds expression in it for perhaps the first time in literature ;—also the idea of the "invariability of the laws of nature."—Fontenelle's "eulogies" [See in particular the eulogies of Vauban, d'Argenson, Newton (1727), Boerhaave, Malebranche, Leibnitz] ;—they are evidence of a subtle intellect ;—of a wide power of comprehension ;—and of a faculty of grouping things so as to allow of their being regarded from the same point of view.—Growing authority of Fontenelle among men of learning ;—in society ;—among literary men.—Fontenelle's later works ;—his *Vie de Corneille*, 1729 ;—his *Réflexions sur la Poétique* ;—his *Théorie des tourbillons cartésiens*, 1752.—The numerous points on which Fontenelle was the harbinger of Voltaire ;—the many personal traits which make him the forerunner of Voltaire ;—and what were the deficiencies that prevented him playing Voltaire's part ?

In the first place he was wanting to a certain degree in originality ;—and above all, to a certain degree, in conviction.—Mme de Tencin's remark : "You have a brain where you ought to have a heart" ;—and, in this connection, of Fontenelle's scepticism ;—it did not consist so much in the belief that it is impossible to arrive at the truth ;—as in the belief that truth is essentially aristocratic ;—that it cannot be communicated to the masses ;—and further that it is of no very great utility.—How this conception of truth is characteristic of the "wit" ;—of the society man and of the epicurean.—Whether it was not this with his work in the retirement of his humble chamber, and his work consists in humanising—in "laicising" it would be said to-day—those elements of Christian doctrine which mankind is most disposed to regard as harsh or as contrary to reason. He softens down the doctrine of the fall; he tempers the doctrine of grace; he banishes God to a distance from the world; he denies His intervention in the affairs of men; he has a way of interpreting the supernatural which makes of it a sort of less obvious conformity with the laws of nature; and his contemporaries made no mistake as to his teaching: they recognised it to be Cartesianism.

They saw a further exemplification of this same doctrine in the scepticism or criticism of Pierre Bayle, of

---

philosophy that prevented Fontenelle putting his whole soul into some great work?—The *Fragments d'un traité de la Raison humaine.*—And that in any case it prevented him exerting the influence he could have exerted had he chosen.—Still, on the other hand, it is a fact that with the exception of Bayle, he did more than any other writer to fashion the generation of the Encyclopedists.

3. The Works.—Fontenelle's works being too little known, we think it right to outline here the contents of the eight volumes of the edition of 1790.

Vol. I.—Documents relating to Fontenelle's biography;—*Dialogues des morts anciens*;—*Dialogues des morts anciens avec les modernes.*

Vol. II.—*Entretiens sur la pluralité des Mondes*;—*Théorie des tourbillons*;—*Histoire des oracles.*

Vol. III.—*Histoire du Théâtre français*;—*Vie de Corneille*;—*Réflexions sur la Poétique*;—*Description de l'empire de Poésie* [Cf. the *Carte du pays de Tendre*].—In this last work occur the following lines, which were evidently [1678] intended for Racine, Boileau, and their followers: "The High Poetry is inhabited by solemn, melancholy, surly people who speak a language which, compared with that spoken in the other provinces of poetry, is what low Breton is to the language of the rest of France."—Fontenelle's operas and tragedies, of which one is in prose, complete the volume.

Vol. IV.—His eight comedies: *Macate*, *Le Tyran*, *Abdolonyme*, the *Testament*, *Henriette*, *Lysianasse*, the *Comète*, and *Pygmalion.*

whom almost the only work consulted to-day is his great Dictionary. But his *Pensées sur la comète* date from 1682, and no work made more noise at the time, or stood the party of the libertines in greater stead. For briefly put, what else is Bayle's criticism but the extension of the Cartesian principle of doubt to dangerous matters, which Descartes had skilfully avoided, and excluded as it were from the application of his method? Bayle, writing like his master from his retreat in Holland, and armed with his Cartesianism, is the first who dares to subject religion and morality to a dissolvent criticism. It may be urged at first sight that he criticises and doubts for the sole pleasure of doubting and criticising. But examine his work more closely and consider attentively some of his conclusions.

The last of these comedies is in verse; the other seven are in prose.

VOL. V.—His ten eclogues;—his miscellaneous poems;—the *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes*;—the *Fragments d'un traité de la Raison humaine*;—and a few minor works of the same stamp at once playful and philosophic.

VOLS. VI. and VII.—The *Eloges* (Eulogies).

VOL. VIII.—The *Doutes sur le système des causes occasionelles.*—The *Lettres galantes du chevalier d'Her . . .*;—and Fontenelle's letters.

There is a modern edition of Fontenelle's works dated 1817.

There have been numerous modern reprints of the *Entretiens sur la pluralité des Mondes* and the *Éloges.*

V.—The Reorganisation of the Academy of Sciences.

1. The SCIENTIFIC MOVEMENT PRIOR TO FONTENELLE,—and of the mistake that is made in overlooking its importance.—The great discoveries in mathematics and the physical sciences were made during the earlier years of the seventeenth century;—also some of the great discoveries in natural science;—and discoveries of greater importance will not be made in any of these fields until towards the close of the following century.—In proof of this assertion it is sufficient to cite some few names: Kepler, 1571–1630;—Galileo, 1564–1642;—Descartes, 1596–1650;—Pascal, 1623–1662;—Huyghens, 1629–1695;

It will be found that he is in nowise addicted to paradox, and when he writes "it is better to be an atheist than an idolater," he knows perfectly well what he is saying, and above all he knows the goal at which he is aiming. Again, is there any doubt as to his intention when he contrasts "the evidences afforded by reason" with "the truths of our religion"; and who does not see or suspect the end he has in view? The truth is, this alleged sceptic is engaged in establishing the sovereignty of reason on the ruins of tradition and authority. "During the reign of Louis XIV. there were already men who are our contemporaries," Diderot will say referring to Bayle, who in fact was the thinker who served the encyclopedists as master. Descartes had been but the

—Newton, 1642–1727.—Or in the field of natural science: Harvey, 1578–1658;—Malpighi, 1628–1694;—Leuvenhoeck, 1632–1723;—Svammerdamm, 1637–1680.—Effects produced by their discoveries.—The telescope and the microscope.—Pascal's observations on the two infinite quantities [Cf. *Pensées*];—physiology in Bossuet's *Traité de la connaisance de Dieu*;—astronomy in La Bruyère's *Caractères* [Cf. the chapter entitled: *Les esprits forts*];—and again in the *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*.—A passage in Perrault's *Parallèles* [fifth and last dialogue, edition of 1696, p. 41, &c].

2. THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.—Its first establishment, 1666,—and its early labours [Cf. Fontenelle, and J. Bertrand, *L'Académie des sciences*].—The construction of the Observatory, 1667.—Huyghens and Rœmer are invited to settle in France.—The laboratory of the Academy.—The king is present at the dissection of an elephant from the Versailles menagerie.—Reorganisation of the Royal Botanical Garden (Jardin des Plantes), 1671.—The "second birth" of the Academy, 1699.—The number of academicians is increased from sixteen to fifty.—The sections: Geometry, Astronomy, Mechanics, Chemistry, Anatomy, and Botany.—The Academy after being under the precarious tutelage of a minister, is accorded the personal protection of the sovereign.

3. SOME OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS REORGANISATION,—or some proofs of the wide diffusion of a taste for science.—The lectures on chemistry by the apothecary Lémery [Cf. Fontenelle, *Éloge de*

harbinger of rationalism: it is Bayle who is its true father.

But where will this rationalism find a foundation on which to take its stand? what will be the model or type of certainty? the point of leverage? "the ultimate immovable basis?" the rock to which we shall cleave so as not to be carried away and drowned in the ocean of doubt? They will be found in science is the answer given at the opportune moment by the witty author, himself another Cartesian, of the *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes.*

The nephew of Corneille,—and therefore the born enemy of Molière, Boileau, Racine and their supporters,—Fontenelle was long considered to be ade-

Lémery]. "Even the ladies, following the fashion, *are bold enough* to show themselves at such learned gatherings."—They flock, too, to the dissections practised by Du Verney;—as do numerous foreigners [Cf. Fontenelle, *Éloge de Du Verney*].—Corroborative evidence furnished by the memoirs of Mme de Staal-Delaunay.—The chemical experiments of the Duc d'Orléans [Cf. Saint-Simon, ix., p. 268, &c.;—and Fontenelle, *Éloge de Homberg*].—The conception of science takes definite shape,—and the idea of progress is evolved [Cf Brunetière, *Études critiques*, v.].

VI.—**Charles Perrault** [Paris, 1628; † 1703, Paris.]

1. THE SOURCES.—Perrault's memoirs published for the first time in 1759;—P. Clément, *Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Colbert* particularly vol. v.; — Niceron, *Hommes illustres*, vol. xliii.; — d'Alembert, *Éloge de Charles Perrault*, in his *Éloges académiques*; —Sainte-Beuve, *Charles Perrault* in his *Causeries du lundi*, vol. v., and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. i.;—Ch. Giraud, *Lettre critique* preceding his edition of the *Contes des Fées*, 1864;—Arvède Barine, *Les Contes de Perrault* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 1, 1890.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.

A. *Chief Clerk of the Works.*—Perrault's family;—the Boileau family and the Perrault family;—Pierre Perrault, the translator of the *Secchia rapita*, 1678 [Cf. Racine in his preface to *Iphigénie*];

quately depicted in the Cydias sketched by La Bruyère, "a mixture of the pedant and the Précieux," whose originality scarcely went further, to continue to quote La Bruyère, "than merely avoiding the profession of other people's ideas while contriving to be of the opinion of somebody." And all these criticisms were deserved. Fontenelle's tragedy *Aspar* is only known to us by an epigram of Racine, but we have his *Eclogues* and his *Lettres galantes du chevalier d'Her* . . . What was Boileau to think of such a passage as the following: "We have been told, sir, that you have become a philosopher, but that your philosophy is the most extraordinary in the world. You do not believe that colours exist! . . . I broached the matter one day with Mme de B——,

—Nicolas Perrault; Claude Perrault, architect and doctor [Cf. Fontenelle, *Éloge de Claude Perrault*];—Charles Perrault;—his early studies and his early verses;—his "travesty" of the sixth book of the Aeneid;—and, in this connection, of the revival of burlesque.—Colbert appoints Perrault secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions;—Perrault gives him the idea for the first Academy of Sciences;—he is charged, together with Chapelain, with drawing up the "List of the King's Bounties."—He is given the control of the Public Works;—his labours;—he suggests to his brother the colonnade of the Louvre;—his disappointments and his retirement.—His "occasional pieces."—The *Saint-Paulin*, 1686;—and, in this connection, of the revival of the epopee. –The *Siècle de Louis le Grand*, 1687;—and of the double claim on our attention of this work;—first as having suggested to Voltaire his *Siècle de Louis XIV.*:—and secondly as having given rise to the quarrel between the ancients and moderns.

B. *Perrault as the Apologist of the Moderns.*—The *Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes*, 1688–1696.—Emotion aroused by these dialogues;—Boileau and Perrault;—Perrault and La Bruyère;—Perrault's thesis and the object of his work [Cf. below "THE QUARREL BETWEEN THE ANCIENTS AND MODERNS."]—Perrault's polite and courteous attitude in the discussion.—Moreover that there is much that is excellent in the *Parallèles*.—That in reading this book, only the opinions of the Abbé of the *Dialogues* should be imparted who is a friend of yours, and who is really pained at your case. She would strangle Descartes if she had him in her power. And it must be admitted that his philosophy is a scurvy doctrine: it strips the ladies of their charms. If there be no such thing as a complexion, what becomes of the roses and lilies of our beauties! It will be useless for you to tell them that colours are in the eyes of those who look, and not in the objects; the ladies will not permit their complexion to be dependent on the eyes of other persons; they intend that it shall be their own property, and if there is no colour at night M. de M—— is nicely caught, for he has fallen in love with Mlle D. L. G. on account of her beautiful complexion and has married her." Voiture has written nothing more

to Perrault.—Reconciliation between Perrault and Boileau.—The publication of the *Hommes illustres de ce siècle*, 1696–1700.

C. *Perrault as a writer of fairy stories*;—and that d'Alembert in his eulogy of Perrault does not even mention his fairy stories;—an omission that is none to d'Alembert's credit;—since *Cendrillon* and the *Chat botté* are the best things Perrault ever wrote;—and from 1680 to 1715 no kind of literature was produced in more abundance than fairy stories.—Of some of Perrault's rivals;—Mme d'Aulnoy, the author of the *Oiseau bleu*;—Mlle de la Force;—Mlle Lhéritier;—[Cf. *Histoire littéraire des femmes françoises* by the abbé de la Porte, Paris, 1769];—and whether this taste for fairy stories should not be connected with that, manifested at the same time, for oriental tales?—The translation of the Arabian Nights, 1704–1708.—Do Perrault's fairy tales deserve the praise that has been bestowed on them?—*Sunt bona, sunt mala quædam, mediocria plura.*—The naïveté of Perrault's tales only exists in the imagination of those whom they amuse;—La Fontaine's remark on Perrault's *Peau d'âne*;—Perrault's subjects are entertaining in themselves;—but he has chosen to present them in a style devoid of charm.

3. THE WORKS.—Perrault's works comprise: (1) a certain number of occasional pieces, such as the *Discours sur l'acquisition de Dunkerque par le Roi*, 1663, or his *Parnasse poussé à bout, sur la difficulté de décrire la conquête de la Franche-Comtè*, 1668;—(2) his *Poème sur la Peinture*, 1668; his *Saint-Paulin*, 1686; and his *Siècle*

"precious," Balzac nothing more affected. But neither Balzac nor Voiture were acquainted with the art of conveying a scientific truth in a similar affected or "precious" dress: and to have done this constitutes Fontenelle's originality. He may be said indeed to serve up Cartesianism, astronomy, physics, and natural history in madrigals; and from this point of view the *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes* is a masterpiece unique of its kind. In gallant and insinuating fashion the work introduces into literature for the first time an entire order of ideas and facts which before had had no part in it. Fontenelle devotes his ingenuity to fostering the new preoccupations that are beginning to steal into men's minds. His effort is successful, and, owing to his footing in society, these novel

de Louis le Grand, 1687;—(3) his *Parallèles*, five dialogues in four vols., published, as has been said, from 1688 to 1696; to which must be joined, as being conceived in the same spirit, his *Hommes illustres*, 1696–1700;—and finally (4) his fairy tales:—*La Belle au bois dormant*, *Le petit Chaperon rouge*, *La Barbe bleue*, *Le Chat botté*, *Les Fées*, *Cendrillon*, *Riquet à la houppe*, *Le Petit Poucet* in prose;—and *Griselidis*, *Peau d'âne*, and *Les souhaits ridicules* in verse.

They were published for the first time separately in Holland between 1694 and 1711; and in volume form by Barbin, 1697–1698, the author being given as Perrault d'Armancour, son of Charles Perrault.

There are innumerable modern editions of the fairy stories.

The *Oiseau bleu*, which is frequently adjoined to them, is by Mme d'Aulnoy; and *Finette ou l'Adroite Princesse* by Mlle Lhéritier.

VII.—**Jean de la Bruyère** [Paris, 1645; † 1696, Versailles].

1. The Sources.—Suard, *Notice sur la vie et les écrits de La Bruyère*, 1781, and printed at the head of several modern editions.—Walckenaer, *Étude sur La Bruyère*, preceding his edition of the *Caractères*, Paris, 1845;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i.; *Nouveaux Lundis*, vol. i. and vol. x.;—A. Vinet, *Moralistes français des XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ siècles*, Paris, 1839;—Edouard Fournier, *La comédie de La Bruyère*, Paris, 1866;—Etienne Allaire, *La Bruyère, dans la maison de Condé*, Paris, 1866.

matters become topics of fashionable conversation. Under these circumstances it may be asked what is there that is still wanting to the victory of Cartesianism and even of science itself? What is wanting is exactly and solely the element which the quarrel between the ancients and moderns is about to supply.

Charles Perrault, a man of wit and merit—who can only be reproached with having, like Scarron, begun his literary career by "travestying" Virgil and with being more learned in "buildings" than in literature—conceives the idea of flattering his king in somewhat novel fashion. He can hit on no better notion than to call his century the "Century of Louis the Great." Is there not the century of Augustus or the century of Pericles? But is

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.

A. *The Moralist.*—La Bruyère's birth;—and that he was the only one of the great writers of his time who was acquainted with four or five languages, including German;—his family and his youth [Cf. Servois, *Notice biographique*].—He is appointed treasurer of the finances for the district of Caen;—he enters the household of Condé in the capacity of tutor to the young Duke of Bourbon, 1684.—The spectacle presented by the Condé household [Cf. Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*.]—La Bruyère's reactions with Bossuet;—and with Boileau.—The alleged "romance" in La Bruyère's life;—and that it has no bearing on literary history.—Was the pean of La Bruyère's book suggested him by Mlle de Montpensier's *Galerie de Portraits*?—or by the "portraits" scattered through the novels of Mlle de Scudéri?—Improbability of this supposition.—On the other hand he was greatly influenced by La Rochefoucauld,—Pascal,—and Malebranche [Cf. Auguste Damien, *Étude sur La Bruyère et Malebranche*, Paris, 1866].—Whether the characters of Theophrastus only served him as a pretext;—or whether he was mistaken as to their literary value;—as was Boileau as to that of the Treatise of Longinus on the Sublime?—The first edition of the *Caractères*, 1688;—and that it contains barely half a dozen portraits;—maxims predominating in it;—and La Bruyère merely emulating La Rochefoucauld in his book as at first produced.

Is there a "plan" in the *Caractères*;—and that in any case it was it enough to say that the century of Louis XIV. is in no wise inferior to that of Augustus or that of Pericles? Perrault holds that it is not. The century of Louis XIV. is not the equal of those of Pericles and Augustus; it surpasses them! and in proportion as the sovereign himself is the superior of Augustus and Pericles, so Bossuet, for instance, is the superior of Demosthenes, Molière the superior of Plautus or Terence, Racine the superior of Euripides, so France is in advance of Athens or Rome, and so in general the moderns are superior to the ancients. In this way begins or is fomented a dispute of which Perrault himself did not foresee the consequences. He merely proposed to flatter his sovereign, and, satisfied with having acted like a good courtier, he

not perceived by Boileau;—and that it is certain that if the chapter *du Mérite personnel* were to follow that *de l'Homme*;—or the chapter *de la Conversation* to precede that *du Cœur*;—it does not appear that the economy of the book would be affected in consequence.—This fact, however, does not prove that the chapter *des Esprits forts* is not a precaution;—on the contrary, in a certain sense, it may be maintained with the author that all the rest of the work leads up to this chapter.—The friend and protégé of Bossuet, the future author of the *Dialogues sur le quietisme*, purposed writing a work of apologetics;—or at any rate he aimed at being a moralist;—as plainly appears, moreover, from a careful reading of the first edition of the book;—or again of the *Discours sur Théophraste*.—La Bruyère proposed to strike a blow at once at the moderns and at the libertines,—as if he had perceived the solidarity of the two causes;—he proposed to reply at the same time to the Perrault's *Siècle de Louis le Grand*;—and to the *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*;—and this double reference to current controversies stood him perhaps in as good stead as his talent in the early editions of his book.

B. *The Artist*.—There was an "artist," however, in La Bruyère;—or, as would be said at the present day, a stylist;—and the artist overshadowed the moralist;—as is proved by the following strange statement:—"Moses, Homer, Plato, Virgil, and Horace are superior to other writers *solely on account of their images*."—Boileau, who would have gone no further, had not the partisans of the ancients compelled him in some sort to look more closely into his paradox. In reality it is the idea of progress, vague as yet, inchoate or floating, scarcely self-conscious, but still this idea and no other that pervades the *Parallèles des anciens et des modernes.* It is in vain that Racine, that La Bruyère in his *Caractères*, 1688–1696, that Boileau in his *Réflexions critiques sur Longin*, 1694, endeavour to stem the current, to exert a contrary influence. The witty retort is made them that they themselves adduce proof in their works of the superiority they are vexed should be accorded the moderns. "How much, exclaims Perrault, does the public prefer to the characters of the divine Theophrastus the reflections of

inclined to this opinion, when expressing it had at least made the restriction:

> Before starting to write, learn to think.

La Bruyère's style;—and that while lacking continuity,—it is nevertheless oratorical;—in the sense that the *Caractères* are the repertory of classic rhetoric.—There are to be found in it every one of the "movements" enumerated in treatises on rhetoric: the interrogation, the exclamation, the suspension, the digression, the interpellation, the adjuration;—every one of the "figures": the extenuation, the hyperbole, the synecdoche, the catachresis, the prosopopoeia;—every one of the "modalities" or modulations from irony to emphasis.—This rhetoric, however, is saved from its own excesses;—by its tendency to realism;—that is to the close imitation of nature;—and, in this connection, of the "naturalism" of La Bruyère.—How careful he is to thoroughly observe his models;—to note in them their respective, individual characteristics;—and to see that each portrait only fits the character it is intended to represent.—The circumstance that La Bruyère's characters were often the portraits of real persons;—and without examining his intention to indulge in personal satire,—that where the identity of these persons can be traced the resemblance of the portrait to the original furnishes proof of the truth to nature of La Bruyère's depictions.—That further proof of his truthfulness to nature is found in his pessimism;—and, in the modern who has given us a translation of them!" [Cf. *Parallèles*, third dialogue, 2nd edition, 1693]. To the side of the moderns flock the rising generation and the women, to say nothing of the members of the Academy, of whom barely six are supporters of Racine and Boileau. Society follows suit. On all sides it is urged that if the matter be strictly examined it is found that it is we, the so-called moderns, who are really the ancients. Our knowledge is more extensive than that of our fathers, and the knowledge of our sons will be more extensive still. Long enough, and indeed too long, have "men, garbed in black and wearing the pedant's cap, held up to us the works of the ancients, not merely as being all that is most beautiful in the world, but as embodying

this connection, a reference once again to the connection between pessimism and realism.—The fact that La Bruyère is rather a melancholy writer than otherwise,—is due to his having endeavoured to see things as they are,—in order to render them as they are.—He may be suspected, however, of having seen things uglier than they are;—or more grotesque than they are;—in order to make them lend themselves to fine effects of style;—and in this way of having been led by the very artifices of his rhetoric into the exaggeration he desired to avoid.

C. *The Satirist.*—Of the interest of this question owing to its bearing on the solution of another question;—that, namely, of the philosophic import of La Bruyère's book.—The famous saying: "A man who is born a Christian and a Frenchman feels himself shackled when attempting satire."—The fourth edition of the *Caractères*, 1689;—and of the growing daring of La Bruyère up to the ninth edition, 1696.—It must be noted, however, that to spare nobody is almost equivalent to attacking nobody.—When a writer scoffs alike at men and women,—at courtiers and townsmen, at financiers and at the magistracy,—at the pious and at the libertines;—he is doubtless a pessimist;—but he is not a revolutionary [Cf. Taine, *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*].—This observation once made, it may and it should be admitted:—that La Bruyère's indignation is ~~deeper than that of~~ La Fontaine;—that he reconciled himself less easily than Molière to the society of his time;—and that the dawning is seen in his writings the very idea of the Beautiful"! The moment has come to escape from this servitude. And the emancipation, which is speedily an accomplished fact, is followed by three consequences.

Men's curiosity takes an altered direction. Forsaking the study and meditation of the works of the ancients, it becomes exclusively bent on the observation of the realities of contemporary existence. Those who were scoffed at in the *Femmes Savantes* have their revenge. "Almost infinite," writes Perrault in his fifth and last dialogue, "are the discoveries that have been made in our century"; and it is a fact, that while in general the historians of our literature have dated wrongly the triumph of Cartesianism, placing it thirty or forty

of a pity that is absent from those of Boileau.—It is the idea of humanity that is beginning to take shape.

Of some other merits of the *Caractères*;—and in particular of certain portraits and narratives;—which herald the approaching vogue of the novel [Cf. Lesage's *Diable Boiteux*].—The transition is accomplished in La Bruyère's book from *character* as it is understood in the comedy of Molière;—to *characters* as they are about to be understood in the novel of manners.—La Bruyère's enemies.—He replies to them in his *Discours de réception à l'Académie*, 1693;—and in the preface to this discourse.—He also essays on this occasion to define the "plan" of his book;—but rather late in the day, imitating in this respect La Rochefoucauld in the preliminary notice to his *Maximes*.—He is successful in showing that all the other chapters are subordinate to the last;—but not that they observe a fixed order or gradation, or that they have a constant bearing on his principal idea.—That it is worth while noting, moreover, that his principal idea is wholly a lay idea;—La Bruyère's religion being a degree less Christian than the religion of Malebranche;—if, indeed, it may not be termed a purely natural religion.—The *Dialogues sur le quiétisme*;—and that they added nothing to the glory of La Bruyère.

3. THE WORKS.—We have mentioned all the works of La Bruyère.

The editions to be consulted are:—the first edition, 1688, reprinted in the *Cabinet du bibliophile*, 1868;—all the following editions down to the ninth inclusive, which appeared in 1696.

years too early, on the other hand they have placed thirty or forty years too late what may be termed the advent of the scientific spirit [Cf. on this point F. Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées*, vol. i., book iii.]. In reality, the reorganisation or the renewal of the Academy of Sciences in 1699 is almost as important and significant a date in French intellectual history as that of the founding of the French Academy in 1635. Boileau may compose if he chooses his *Satire des femmes :*

> . . . . Good ! it is that blue-stocking
> Of whom Roberval has a high opinion and whom Sauveur frequents ;

but nevertheless the very women henceforth take an interest in geometry, and the spectacle of a dissection,

We shall confine ourselves to citing among modern editions :—Walckenaër's edition, 1845 ;—Destailleur's edition, 1854 ;—G. Servois' edition in the "Grands Ecrivains de la France" series, Paris, 1865–1878, Hachette.

Two "classic" editions also deserve mention :—Hémardinquer's edition, 1849, 1854, 1872, 1890, Delagrave ;—and Rébelliau's edition, 1890, Hachette.

VIII.—**François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon** [château of Fénelon, near Sarlat, 1651 ; † 1715, Cambrai].

1. The Sources.—Fénelon's voluminous correspondence, printed at the end of the Versailles edition, and completed by a considerable number of letters published in 1849, 1850, 1853, 1869, 1873, and 1892.

La Harpe, *Éloge de Fénelon*, 1771 ;—d'Alembert, *Éloge de Fénelon*, 1774 ;—Cardinal de Bausset, *Histoire de Fénelon*, 3rd edition, 1817 ;—Abbé Gosselin, *Histoire littéraire de Fénelon*, 1843 ;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ii., 1850, and vol. x., 1854 ;—P. Janet, *Fénelon* in the "Grands Ecrivains Français" series, Paris, 1892 ;—R. Mahrenholz, *Fénelon, ein Lebensbild*, *Leipsick*, 1896.

O. Douen, *L'intolérance de Fénelon*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1875.

Tabaraud, *Supplément aux histoires de Bossuet et de Fénelon*, Paris, 1822 ;—A. Bonnel, *La controverse de Bossuet et de Fénelon sur le quiétisme*, Mâcon, 1850 ;—Algar Griveau, *Étude sur la condemna-*

which Molière thought so comic when he made his Thomas Diafoirus offer it to Angélique in the *Malade imaginaire,* is now a spectacle the sex flocks to witness. The anatomist Du Verney, when introducing Mlle de Launay to the Duchesse du Maine, explains that "of all the young women of France, it is she who is best acquainted with the human body," and the statement is considered perfectly natural. On the other hand it is held to be extraordinary that men should still be found who, while priding themselves on their judgment and taste, confess to an admiration for Pindar. We are the men of the present day, and what we are chiefly concerned to know is the world in which we live and to which we belong! And what can Aristotle the Stagyrite and

tion du livre des Maximes des saints, Paris, 1878;—Guerrier, *Madame Guyon, sa vie et sa doctrine*, Paris, 1881;—Crouslé, *Fénelon et Bossuet*, Paris, 1894;—abbé Delmont, *Fénelon et Bossuet*, Lyons, 1896.

Emmanuel de Broglie, *Fénelon à Cambrai*, Paris, 1884.

Consult too, but cautiously, Saint-Simon's *Mémoires*;—the letters of the Duchesse d'Orléans;—and La Beaumelle, *Mémoires et correspondance de Madame de Maintenon.*

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—He is a further example of a writer who does not resemble his style;—and the real Fénelon was just as hard, inflexible and overbearing as the style of *Télémaque* is mellifluous and even unctuous.—If there be added to this essential characteristic a very high idea of himself, of his family, and of his personal dignity; a natural preciosity displayed in a taste for strange and unusual opinions; and finally a sort of insincerity of which he is scarcely conscious;—an idea will be obtained of the Fénelon of the first period of his life,—from whom the second Fénelon was only evolved very late in his career;—and the idea will be incomplete since Fénelon is a strangely complex and fluctuating character;—still it will allow of his being understood;—and will give a sort of unity to his life, his rôle, and his work.

A. *Fénelon's early years.*—His family;—his early studies; Cahors, the collège du Plessis, and the seminary of Saint-Sulpice.—His

Cicero, who hailed from Arpinum, know on this subject or teach us in connection with it?

The influence of these new ideas, or more accurately of the new direction taken by men's curiosity, may quickly be traced even in the partisans of antiquity themselves, in the *Caractères* of La Bruyère, for instance, or in Fénelon's *Télémaque*, the respective dates of which are 1696 as regards the last edition of the *Caractères*, and 1699 for *Télémaque*. It was La Bruyère who was the first to be attacked or railed at by the moderns, while as for Fénelon he was destined to remain faithful to the ancients to the end of his life. And yet in what direction did the interests of La Bruyère really lie? He has told us explicitly in a very curious passage

youthful letters [to Bossuet and to the Marquise de Laval];—and that they are characterised by preciosity.—He is put in charge of the *Nouvelles catholiques*.—Is what Saint-Simon says of the intrigues of Fénelon to secure his advancement to be believed?—and that, as a general rule, it is always prudent at any rate to begin by disbelieving Saint-Simon.—Did he even ever see Fénelon?—That in any case Louis XIV. distrusted Fénelon to start with;—never inviting him, in spite of his early successes as an orator [Cf. the *Sermon pour la fête de l'Epiphanie*, 1685], to preach before the court;—while after the success of his "Saintonge Mission," 1686–1687, the king declined to confer on him either the bishopric of Poitiers, or that of La Rochelle.—How Fénelon triumphed over his sovereign's prejudice against him;—thanks to the intervention in his behalf of the Duc de Beauvilliers, of Mme de Maintenon,—and of Bossuet.—He belonged to the group of persons who formed Bossuet's habitual society.—At the request of Bossuet hè writes his *Réfutation du Traitè de la nature et de la grâce*, directed against Malebranche.—He is appointed tutor to the royal children, 1689.

B. *His early works*.—The *Sermon pour la fête de l'Epiphanie*, 1685,—and that it almost marks an epoch in pulpit eloquence.—Seduction, charm, and elevation of Fénelon's manner.—The *Traité de l'éducation des filles*, 1686;—and, in this connection, of the progress made since Molière and his *Femmes savantes*.—*Télémaque*, 1693–1694?—and of the principal questions it raises.—What was Fénelon's of his book, which is not a book, but the collected fruit of his direct and close observation of his contemporaries. "There arise among men infinite combinations of power, of favour, of genius, of riches, of dignities, of birth, of strength, of industry, of capacity, of vice, of weakness, of virtue, of stupidity, of poverty, of powerlessness, of humbleness, and of vileness. *These elements, mingled together in a thousand different manners and mutually compensated, give rise to the different classes and the different social grades.*" And we declare in turn, that in his *Caractères*, it is these thousand combinations, these different classes and different social grades that he delights to depict, and no longer "man in general." He does more than take nature for his model; in reality he goes

intention in writing the work?—In writing it did he merely take an artistic satisfaction in so "disfiguring" antiquity as to bring it into accordance with his own conception of the period?—or was it his intention to indulge in satire? [Cf. the *Lettre à Louis XIV.*];—or, again, was his purpose to set forth his scheme of government?—How far was Fénelon responsible for the publication of the book in 1699?—and, in this connection, of strange sentence in his *Mémoire* in which he exonerates himself from all responsibility in the matter;—"he preferred, he says, to allow it to appear in a deformed and distorted shape, than to issue it as he had written it."—Whether the unfaithful copyist whom he accuses of having stolen his manuscript was not well inspired in only publishing it after Fénelon had been appointed to the see of Cambrai in 1695?—[Cf. L. Genay, *Étude littéraire et morale sur le Télémaque*, Paris, 1876; and L. Boulvé, *De l'hellénieme chez Fénelon*, Paris, 1897].

C. *The great controversies.*—The Quietist controversy [Cf. above, BOSSUET].—Difficulties of Fénelon's situation.—His dilatory tactics;—and beneath his apparent gentleness,—his unconquerable resistance.—The essence of the controversy and the question of pure or disinterested love.—The seduction the doctrine would exercise on Fénelon given his aristocratic and singular nature.—The quarrel becomes complicated by political considerations.—Fénelon's ambition,—and that it is superabundantly proved;—by his *Lettre à Louis XIV.*;—by to current events for his inspiration, and his one ambition is to give a vivid picture of "the manners of his time." We touch here on the chief reason of the immense success of his book. People recognise their neighbours in its pages. Such an one is *Diphile*, such an one *Théodecte*. Everybody can put a name to *Irène*, to *Laïs*, or to *Césonie*. Hence it is that the book is amusing, that it is instructive: it teaches in how many ways one man may differ from another. But La Bruyère complains that "great subjects are forbidden him"; five or six years pass and Fénelon essays them in his *Télémaque*.

I do not believe there exists a book, a celebrated and justly celebrated book, in which antiquity is presented us in a falser light than in *Télémaque;* and I do not except

Télémaque and by his *Tables de Chaulnes*.—The utopia of Fénelon;—and its retrograde character.—Is it to be regretted that his pupil did not reign?—His condemnation, March 12, 1699, and the Letters Patent of August 14th.—His exile at Cambrai.—In his exile he continues to keep in communication with his party [Cf. his correspondence with the Duke of Burgundy], and to occupy himself with the scheme of government he looks forward to being able to put in force.—His conflict with the Jansenists;—and of the unscrupulousness he displayed in the course of it.—His attitude in this instance may be regarded as his revenge for the defeat he had suffered;—and in any case as wholly characteristic of one side of his policy.—Imprudence of this policy;—seeing that the ruin of Port-Royal contributed as much as the revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the progress of libertinism.—Hopes conceived by Fénelon at the time of the death of the Dauphin [Cf. his letter of April 14, 1711];—it is at this juncture that he composes his *Tables de Chaulnes*.—Death of the Duke of Burgundy [February, 1712].

D. *Fénelon's last years*.—Although the hopes that had buoyed him up for the last fifteen years are shattered, he does not abandon himself to despair;—but on the contrary accepts his fate as a special manifestation in his interest of the will of God [Cf. his correspondence for the years 1712, 1713, 1714].—His remark to the Duc de Chaulnes: "My dear Duke, let us die without regret" [March, 1712];—and it may be said that from this moment his sole and ardent concern even the *Cyrus* or the *Clélie* of Mlle de Scudéri, to whom moreover, it owes as much as to Sophocles or Homer Bossuet esteemed the work to be "unworthy" of a priest and I am much afraid that he was right. Still, if th book be read as it ought to be read, that is with the date a which it was written constantly in view, the impression i produces is at once modified. As is the case with La Bruyère, it is "portraits" and "contemporary portraits" that Fénelon draws. Mentor is he himself, and Télémaque is the Duke of Burgundy. He lectures the prince, and less on the subject of morality than on that of government.

> The tale serves to pass off the precept.

He discusses problems of statesmanship, and chimerica

was to prepare himself for death.—Still he seeks distraction;—and writes his *Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie française*, 1714;— perhaps, too, he revises his *Dialogues de l'éloquence*; and his *Trait de l'existence de Dieu*.—He continues to combat the last remnants o Jansenism;—and administers his diocese admirably.—He is mortally stricken, however;—and the spectacle of his gradual throwing off o his former self, year by year and almost month by month, is exceedingly beautiful.

E. Of *some other of Fénelon's works*.—The *Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie française*;—and that it bears traces of Fénelon's strange and unusual bent of mind.—His judgment on French poetry;— which he complains is the slave of the laws of versification.—His judgment on Molière.—His scheme for a treatise on history.—His *Dialogues sur l'éloquence* [published in 1718]; and that they contain all the objections against and the criticisms of pulpit eloquence, which will afterwards be elaborated by Voltaire;—that in this respect the work would have come better from a man of letters than from a bishop;— while it is sovereignly unjust as far as it refers to Bourdaloue.—Indeed Fénelon is already quite of the view of a modern critic;—and the words of Edmond Scherer might almost be put into his mouth: "the sermon is a spurious branch of literature."—The *Traité de l'existence de Dieu*; and of the influence of the scientific movement of the time on the first part of the book.—Comparison between the second part and Malebranche's *Entretiens sur la métaphysique*;—and of the ease though his views may be they are closely connected with the situation of France at his time. In short, he too seeks his inspiration in current events. He has a goal in view, and a goal that is neither distant nor indistinct, but in proximity and clearly defined. Was it possible, under these conditions, that *Télémaque* should not have aroused the eager curiosity of its writer's contemporaries, that they should not have seen that they themselves were its subject matter, that they should not have essayed to gather from the lessons of the tutor what manner of government would be that of his royal pupil? For these reasons Fénelon's "novel" is the outcome, as were the *Caractères*, of the newly developed thirst for knowledge. It is the book of a reformer, and this despite the fact that the aristocratic ideal

with which more than one passage in it might be made out to have pantheistic leanings.

After what precedes it is incumbent to add:—that, while in Fénelon's case the style is not "the man";—for the only point of resemblance between his character and his style is the marvellous suppleness of both;—yet his style is instinct with a very keen charm;—a sort of social optimism;—and also a very keen sentiment for what is about to be called humanity.—The truth is that Fénelon was very kind,—to those who recognised his superiority;—and he was very sensitive.—It is evidently to these two characteristics that he owes his reputation as a philosopher or even as a philanthropist [Cf. La Harpe in his eulogy, and the *Fénelon* of Marie-Joseph Chénier];—and in this way the world has formed an idea of Fénelon, as it has of Bossuet, which is false as far as it is arrived at—but no further—by an attempt to judge of the character of the men from the nature of their writings.

3. THE WORKS.—They are divided, or rather they have been divided in the Versailles edition, into five classes.

(1) *Theological and controversial works*, of which the principal are:—the *Traité de l'existence et des attributs de Dieu*, 1712, 1718;—the *Lettre à l'évêque d'Arras sur la lecture de l'Ecriture sainte en langue vulgaire*, 1707, 1718;—and the *Réfutation du Traité de la nature et de la grâce*, published for the first time in 1820 [vols. i., ii. and iii.]—Volumes iv., v., vi., vii., viii. and ix. contain Fénelon's dif-

of the archbishop of Cambrai lies wholly in the past, as we clearly see to-day, though nobody perceived the truth at the time. Fénelon interests the men of his epoch in themselves, an achievement that accorded exactly with the demands of the coterie of the moderns.

There are other works which, although they are of inferior literary merit, are not less significant of the transformation that is in progress; and disrespectful as it may seem to speak in the same breath of *Télémaque* or the *Caractères* and of the comedies of Dancourt, in reality the association of these works is more interesting and instructive than it is slighting to Fénelon or La Bruyère. It is in Dancourt's pieces that the transformation takes place of the comedy of character into the

---

ferent writings on the subject of Quietism with the exception of the *Maximes des saints;*—while volumes x., xi., xii., xiii., xiv., xv. and xvi. contain his writings against Jansenism.

(2) *His moral and devotional works*, comprising:—his *Sermons*, of which the principal are the *Sermon pour l'Epiphanie*, 1685, and the *Sermon pour le sacre de l'Electeur de Cologne*, 1707;—his *Lettres sur divers points de spiritualité*, 1718, 1738;—and, included in this class for no obvious reason, the *Traité sur l'éducation des filles*, 1687 [vols. xvii. and xviii.].

(3) Fénelon's diocesan charges, 1701 to 1713 [vol. xviii.]

(4) Literary works including:—thirty-six *Fables*;—the *Dialogues des morts*, an imitation, probably, of Fontenelle's work. The edition of 1700 contains four dialogues,—that of 1712 forty-seven,—that of 1718 sixty-nine,—that of 1787 seventy-four,—that of 1823 eighty-one;—the *Aventures de Télémaque*, 1699 and 1717;—the *Dialogues sur l'éloquence*, 1718, and sundry minor works including the *Lettre sur les occupations de l'Académie française*, 1716 [vols. xix., xx., xxi. and xxii.]

(5) *Political writings* including:—*Divers Mémoires concernant la guerre de la succession d'Espagne*;—the *Examen de conscience sur les devoirs de la royauté*;—and the *Essai philosophique sur le gouvernement civil.* This last work is not by Fénelon, but was written by the Chevalier de Ramsai "in accordance with the principles of M. de Fénelon," and published in London in 1721 [vol. xxii.].

comedy of manners, in his "curtain-raisers" as well as in his more important plays—in the *Moulin de Javelle*, in the *Foire de Besons*, in the *Vendanges de Suresne*, as in the *Chevalier à la mode*, in the *Femme d'intrigues*, or in the *Agioteurs*. And as for the comedy of manners, in what does it exist if not in the presentation of the foibles of the hour and the follies of the period in a scenario that itself is wholly contemporary? Plays of this stamp are a mirror in which the comic author invites us to recognise ourselves; and, for our part, after making allowance for the exaggeration inseparable from caricatures, and further necessitated, as we are aware, by the requirements of dramatic art, what we look for in such plays is our own likeness. The attractiveness, however, of comedy of this

It remains to mention the Correspondence in twelve volumes:—Correspondence with the Duke of Burgundy [vol. i.];—Miscellaneous letters [vols. ii., iii., iv.];—letters dealing with spiritual matters [vols. v. and vi.];—letters relating to the Quietist controversy [vols. vii., viii., ix., x., xi.]—Vol. xii. contains a good review of Fénelon's works.

IX.—The Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns.

1. **The Origin of the Quarrel.**—Three lines of Horace:

> Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos
> Progeniem vitiosiorem;

—and that notwithstanding Bodin [Cf. above Bodin];—Bacon and his *De augmentis*;—Descartes [Cf. *Discours de la méthode*, vi.];—and Pascal [*Fragment d'un Traité du vide*];—the idea expressed by these three lines was entertained "by all thoughtful persons" until towards 1680.—The real quarrel,—the result, like many important events, of insignificant causes,—has a threefold origin. It arose out of:—(1) the controversies touching the "miraculous character of Christianity";—controversies which inevitably raised the question of the superiority of Christianity over Paganism [Cf. Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin's preface to *Clovis* and to *Marie-Magdeleine*];—(2) the mere spectacle of the progress made by science between the time of Descartes and that of order, whatever its literary value, lies, just as does the attractiveness of the *Caractères*, in the fidelity of observation displayed in it. What is asked of the author is no longer that he shall unravel a plot or develop a thesis, but that he shall hit off his models accurately; and, in response to this demand, the author allows himself to be directed both in his choice of subjects and in his mode of treating them by passing events. Dancourt is such an author. He is without genius, his talent is slight, his comedy is superficial, his wit is often coarse; on the other hand, his plays abound in details relating to manners, in scraps of dialogue transported on to the stage from real life, and I will not dare to say in portraits—it would be doing him too much honour—but at least in silhouettes of

---

Newton;—(3) the idea that occurred to Charles Perrault of disparaging the ancients with a view to flattering Louis XIV.—The sitting of the French Academy held on January 27, 1687 [Cf. Rigault, *Histoire de la querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*].—Indignation of the partisans of the ancients: La Fontaine, Boileau, Racine.—Fontenelle supports Perrault in his *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes*, 1688.—The first edition of the *Caractères* appears almost simultaneously [the royal authorisation for its printing is dated October, 1687];—and Perrault determines to write his *Parallèles*,—of which the first volume appeared in October of the same year.—Fontenelle elected to the French Academy, 1691;—election of La Bruyère, 1693.—Boileau replies to the *Parallèles* in his *Réflexions critiques sur Longin*, 1694;—Perrault publishes the concluding volume of his *Parallèles* in 1696;—he treats in it of the superiority of the moderns in the matter of science;—and the quarrel seems appeased by Boileau's letter to Perrault, 1701.

2. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUARREL;—and of the error that has been committed in regarding it as a quarrel between pedants.—In addition to Rigault's estimable book on the subject, students should read Auguste Comte's pronouncement on the matter [Cf. *Cours de philosophie positive*, vol. iii., forty-seventh lesson;—and Pierre Leroux's treatise, *Sur la Loi de la continuité qui relie le XVII^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle*].—The real point at issue in the quarrel is:

A. *From the pedagogic point of view*,—Will the ancients remain personages, who dress, speak, move about, behave themselves, feel and think after the fashion of people of the year 1700. It remains that there shall appear on the scene a more skilful artist, and above all a more conscientious artist and one more devoted to his art, and that he shall improve on Dancourt if he can! Still, as it is, the comedy of Molière is threatened, or even already undermined. The case is the same with the politics of Bossuet and with the æsthetics of Boileau, and all three writers are the butt of the same patient, subtle, and almost invisible enemy.

This enemy might be said, if desired, to be a contempt or rather a disdain for tradition, but I prefer to speak of it as a frenzy or a rage for novelty. Nothing gives more flavour

---

the educators of humanity for all time?—for what reasons?—and in virtue of what privilege?—Ronsard was saturated with Greek tradition,—and Malherbe with Latin tradition;—and the question is, has not the time come for writers to be purely French?—La Bruyère, in his *Discours sur Théophraste*, shows that he appreciates that these are the points at issue, and very skilfully defends the ancients;—by justifying the authority of tradition on the ground of the element of eternal truth contained in the writings of the ancients;—and contained in consequence of their greater faithfulness to nature;—while he also urges that they expressed ideas the propriety of which is still recognised after the lapse of three thousand years;—in spite of the immense changes in manners,—in customs,—and in the very conception that obtains of life.—In the second place:

B. *From the philosophic point of view*;—the question at issue is that of progress;—an idea of which a conception, confused as yet, but undoubtedly existent, was abroad at the period;—and an idea the paternity of which has wrongly been ascribed to Turgot.—Explicit passages in the *Parallèles*:—[Cf. vol. iv., p. 40] arithmetical progress.—[Cf. vol. iv., p. 72] organic progress.—[Cf. vol. iv., p. 119] evolution or progress by differentiation;—and in this connection that it is undoubtedly Perrault who triumphed over convictions;—which Pascal and Descartes had only shaken.

C. *From the æsthetic or literary point of view*;—the point at issue was whether the ancients had attained to perfection;—and laid or "spice" to a literary work than an air of novelty! Unfortunately, although truth may "have a bearded chin," as Malebranche said, it is the truth for all that; and what is more, it is not given to every one to strike out a new line, or to strike out a new line when he wishes to or because he wishes to. It must also be borne in mind that tradition at no period represents the whole of the past, but, on the contrary, only that small portion of it which has survived. Tradition is not Mevius or Bavius, who have passed into utter oblivion, but Virgil and Horace, who have survived. And why have they survived? Boileau has answered the question in excellent fashion: "It is because the esteem in which they are held does not depend in reality on the length of time during

down laws that can only be swerved from to the detriment of art;—or whether, on the contrary, the various branches of literature must not necessarily be developed and transformed in the course of time.

3. Some Consequences of the Quarrel.—It transferred the golden age of humanity from one period to another;—dealt tradition in this way a serious blow;—and completed the triumph of Cartesianism.—For whatever the divisions among the Cartesians, they are all agreed on this point:—that optimism is justified by reason;—or that optimism is the only reasonable opinion [Cf. in this connection Spinoza's *Ethics*, Malebranche's *Entretiens*, and Leibnitz's *Théodicée*].—Another consequence of the quarrel was to subject literature in all its branches to the authority of fashion; fashion being merely the search for novelty whether in the matter of ideas or of that of dress and customs;—and, in this connection, of the great number of women writers at the close of the reign of Louis XIV.;—Mme Deshoulières [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Une ruelle politique sous Louis XIV.* in his *Portraits de femmes*];—Mme de Villedieu, Mlle Bernard, Mme Durand, Mlle de la Force, Mme d'Aulnoy, Mlle Lhéritier, Mme de Murat [Cf. Abbé de la Porte, *Histoire littéraire des femmes*, and Gordon de Percel (Lenglet du Fresnoy), *Bibliothèque des romans*].—And from all these consequences there results in turn another consequence:—the disorganisation of pulpit eloquence;—and of tragedy;—the parodying of lyricism;—the transformation of comedy and of the novel.

which their works have survived, but on the length of time during which their works have been admired," or, in other words: "The antiquity of a writer is not a certain sign of his merit, but the long-standing and constant admiration that has always been entertained for his works is sure and infallible proof that they ought to be admired." [Cf. *Réflexions critiques sur Longin*, reflection vii.]. It would be impossible to employ more sensible language. But in the year 1700, Boileau is not among those who are listened to, if indeed he be not among those who are scoffed at; and at this juncture writers, instead of aiming, as they did in his time, at being superior to their predecessors, seek to be "different" from them. Massillon expressly made this

X.—**Jean-Baptiste Massillon** [Hyères, 1663; † 1742, Clermont-Ferrand].

1. THE SOURCES.—D'Alembert, *Éloge de Massillon*, in his *Éloges académiques*;—Maury, *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire*;—Abbé Bayle, *Massillon*, Paris, 1867;—Abbé Blampignon, *Massillon*, Paris, 1879, and *L'Episcopat de Massillon*, 1884;—F. Brunetière, *L'Eloquence de Massillon*, Paris, 1881;—Abbé Allais, *Massillon*, Toulouse, 1883;—M. Cohendy, *Correspondances, Mandements, etc., de Massillon*, Clermont, 1883.

2. MASSILLON'S ELOQUENCE.—Of the "profane" character of Massillon's *Sermons*;—and of the defects and at the same time of the qualities this epithet "profane" must be understood to convey.—No orator has ever contrived to say so little while employing such a multitude of words;—or, on the other hand, to say that little in more harmonious language;—no orator, again, has made more abusive use of every rhetorical expedient;—but no orator has known better how to turn rhetoric to account;—to give life to abstract truths;—to lend his discourse an air of "elegance" or sustained distinction;—and to suit religion to an audience of fine ladies and courtiers.

Massillon had recourse to the same rhetorical expedients even in planning his sermons.—His method is to sketch the plan of his sermon before he is very sure as to what he will put into it.—Of the measure of ingenuousness that this mode of composition presupposes;

confession. The highly impertinent question was put him whether, mounting the pulpit after such men as Bossuet and Bourdaloue, he flattered himself he would surpass them: "I shall preach *differently*," he answered his indiscreet questioner. And—this justice must be done him—he kept his word: he preached differently but not so well. As for the consequences of this rage for novelty, of which Massillon was an eloquent example, they speedily prove to be what it might have been foreseen they would be: the decadence or demeaning of all the nobler or more elevated branches of literature.

May it be the case that certain of these branches had exhausted themselves as it were, owing to over-production, owing to their having furnished too many masterpieces in

—and of the measure of artifice [Cf. the sermons *Sur la Mort du pécheur et la Mort du juste*, or *Sur l'enfant prodigue*].—Comparison, in this connection, between Massillon's expedients and Bourdaloue's method.—Of the importance of the details in Massillon's sermons.—His affectation of preciosity.

How this preciosity has its influence even on his doctrine;—and leads him to display alternately excessive rigorism,—or excessive complaisancy.—Carried away by his flow of words he says more than he means to say;—as when he declares that "ambition is the most marked characteristic of a base soul";—or when he exaggerates the good it is in the power of nature to accomplish.—It will now be understood what is meant when he is reproached with having been a mere rhetorician;—it only remains to add that he is one of the most delightful of rhetoricians;—a fact that explains his success as a preacher;—the admiration the Encyclopedists will profess for him;—and the real pleasure experienced in reading him.

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Massillon comprise two series of Advent sermons, joined together, and numbering in all ten sermons;—forty-one High Lent sermons;—ten minor Lent sermons;—eight sermons on the Mysteries;—ten panegyrics;—six funeral orations, including those on Louis XIV. and on the Dauphin;—four *Sermons de vêture*;—and a certain number of Conferences, Charges, Synodical Discourses, etc.

Apart from the funeral orations, the only sermons whose date is too short a space of time? This is the reason Voltaire would content himself with, and we are not going to deny that it contains a portion of the truth. Literary branches are subject to fatigue and exhaustion; they die out as species do in nature, when they cease to find around them the conditions necessary to their development. Genius itself would seek in vain to revive them under these conditions. But they die out yet more surely when they become blind to their true nature. This is the fate which, at the point we have reached, definitely overtakes lyric poetry—of the true genius of which Malherbe, as we have seen, was but partially conscious—as exemplified in the Odes and Cantatas of Jean-Baptiste Rousseau. Jean-Baptiste is the model or

absolutely certain are the twelve minor Lent sermons. They were preached in 1718 in the chapel of the Tuileries for the benefit and in the presence of Louis XV., still a child at the time.

The first authentic edition of Massillon's works is that published by his nephew, Father J. Massillon of the Oratory, in 1745, and in the absence of manuscripts all subsequent editions have had no option but to follow this edition [Cf. Sacy, *Variétés littéraires et morales*].

XI.—French Tragedy from 1680 to 1715.

1. The Sources.— The brothers Parfaict, *Histoire du théâtre français*, vol. xii. to xx;—Léris, *Dictionnaire des Théâtres*;—Petitot, *Répertoire du théâtre français*, vol. i. and ii.;—d'Alembert, *Eloges de Campistron et de Crébillon*;—Villemain, *Littérature française au XVIII^e siècle*;—A Vitu, *Crébillon*, notice preceding his edition of this writer's works, 1885;—F. Brunetière, *Les Époques du théâtre français*, 1892.

2. The Successors of Racine.—The actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne combine with those of Molière's theatre—and the Comédie-Française is founded.—The first performance at the Comédie-Française: *Phèdre* and the *Carrosses d'Orléans*.—J. G. Campistron [1656, † 1723],—and whether, as Voltaire has declared, "his plots are better constructed than those of Racine"?—He doubtless means that they are more romantic.—*Arminius*, 1684 and *Andronic*, 1685.—The first statutes of the Comédie-Française, April–October, 1685.—Pradon's

type of the spurious man of talent. It is merely with a view to completeness that I mention the comedies of Regnard,—the *Ménechmes*, the *Folies amoureuses*, the *Légataire universel*,—the least of whose errors is to imagine that he has struck out a new line by returning, after an interval of fifty years, to the *lazzi* and imbroglios of Italian comedy. Still, let it be conceded him that his plays are cleverly written! It is impossible to say as much for the tragedies of the elder Crébillon from the moment that *Atrée et Thyeste* and *Rhadamiste et Zénobie* are his masterpieces! Whereas tragedy had owed its evolution to the elimination from its scope of the romantic element, under the auspices of this sombre poet it is again invaded and even swamped by this discarded material.

very successful piece: *Régulus*, 1688.—The "King's Comedians" take possession of their theatre in the Rue des Fossés-Saint-Germain [at the present day Rue de l'Ancienne-Comédie];—and give their first performance 18th April, 1689: *Phèdre* and the *Médecin malgré lui*.—Mlle Bernard's *Brutus* [written in collaboration with Fontenelle], 1690.—Lagrange-Chancel's first tragedy: *Adherbal*, 1694;—Longepierre's first tragedy: *Médée*, 1694.—Thomas Corneille's last tragedy: *Bradamante*, 1695.—Antoine de la Fosse [1653, † 1708];—and the success of his *Manlius Capitolinus*, 1698;—of which as late a writer as Villemain speaks as if it were a sort of masterpiece.—And yet, leaving on one side the recrudescence of novelty by which such a play as *Manlius* might benefit between 1790 and 1820 owing to favouring circumstances;—and to the genius of Talma;—what is best in *Manlius* belongs to Saint-Réal as the author of the *Conjuration des Espagnols contre Venise*;—or to Thomas Otway, the English dramatist, as the author of *Venice Preserved*;—and only what remains to Antoine de la Fosse.—Crébillon's first tragedies: *Idoménée*, 1705;—and, in this connection, of the influence of *Télémaque* on the conception of antiquity which will obtain henceforth.

3. Crébillon's Plays.—Prosper Jolyot de Crébillon (1674, † 1762);—his extraction and his youthful years;—his lack of primary instruction and of mental culture;—Boileau's remark concerning Crébillon: "The Scudéris and the Pradons at whom we scoffed so heartily in my youth, were eagles compared with these writers."—A

Crébillon sells as a pure Burgundy wine
A fumy wine of Auvergne blended with the grape of Lignage.

What becomes of pulpit eloquence, at this same juncture, is known to everybody by the sermons of Massillon. As one of his contemporaries says, it has developed into " a pleasure in which the very senses seem to participate " : and if this appreciation be just, as in my opinion it is, what terms at once more flattering and more profane could be employed to characterise the merit of a madrigal, of a love elegy, or of some Anacreontic ode?

Under the influence of all these causes the character of the language itself undergoes a change. To the stately sentence, a little long at times but so nobly spacious, to

remark of Montesquieu to the contrary effect;—and what does he mean when he says that Crébillon "made him enter into transports akin to those of the Bacchantes"?—Crébillon's most successful pieces: *Atrée*, 1707;—*Electre*, 1708;—*Rhadamiste*, 1711.—How the romantic element reappears in tragedy through the intermediary of Crébillon's "masterpieces."—His choice of subjects;—and that while he is careful as a rule that they shall be "atrocious," he is still more careful that they shall be "extraordinary" [Cf. the subject of *Atrée*, that of *Rhadamiste* or that again of *Pyrrhus*].—The nature of the plots in Crébillon's plays;—and of the two signs by which their romantic side, and their artificial and arbitrary side, are seen:—the starting point of the action is a *misapprehension*, it proceeds to turn on a *qui pro quo* and the end is brought about by the *recognition* of the truth.—The depiction of character in Crébillon's plays;—and that it is as wanting in conscientiousness as is the depiction of the passions therein in truth to nature;—his tragedies are entirely lacking in general or human interest.—Of some other characteristics of Crébillon's plays; —and of the declamatory affectation which he takes to be eloquence. —Crébillon's tragedies are merely "melodramas" written in verse.

4. THE FORERUNNERS OF VOLTAIRE;—and the new tendencies of tragedy.—Abundance of tragedies based on biblical subjects: Abbé Brueys' *Gabinie*, 1699;—Abbé Nadal's *Saül*, 1705;—and, one after the other:—*Hérode*, 1709;—*Joseph*, 1710;—*Absalon*, 1712;—*Jonathas*, 1714.—The first performance of Racine's *Athalie*, 1716.—

the complex and genuinely "organic" sentence of Pascal and Bossuet, of Racine and Malebranche, to this periodic sentence, whose sinuous construction is such an admirable presentment of the processes of thought, there now succeeds a lighter and brisker sentence, a sentence that is unencumbered and quicker of foot, so to speak. The period, after tending for a while towards heaviness, becomes disjointed or is broken up. "For the past twenty years writers have strictly observed the rules,—La Bruyère declares as early as 1688,—they have been the slaves of construction, they have enriched the language with new words, *thrown off the yoke of Latinism and evolved a style in which the sentence is purely French.*" What he means to say is that the rules have been laid down of a style which

Mythological subjects,—and that they are the outcome of the growing influence of the Opera: Lagrange-Chancel's *Méléagre*, 1699;—de la Fosse's *Thésée*, 1700;—*La Mort d'Ulysse*, 1707;—The *Tyndarides* and *Atrée and Thyeste*, 1707;—*Electre*, 1708;—*Ino et Mélicerte*, 1713;—and how the pieces of this class completed the deformation of the conception of tragedy;—by giving less and less place in it to the observation of reality,—and converting it into a mere recreation without profit or significance.—Whether this mistake is counterbalanced by the political tendencies which creep into some of these tragedies,—in such a way as to make them herald the coming of Voltaire?—But the efforts to rejuvenate this branch of the drama are vain;—and nothing can prevail against the opinion which is taking root;—to the effect that people no longer go to the theatre to have their feelings profoundly stirred;—but to be diverted or amused;—and that the primary charm of stage fiction lies precisely in its air of unreality.—Henceforth the subjects are merely pretexts for stage effects or ingenious verses;—neither authors nor spectators attach any importance to them,—except so far as it is necessary to do so with a view to passing an hour or two agreeably.

5. THE WORKS.—Of all the pieces just enumerated there are not half a dozen that are still remembered;—or a single one that theatrical managers still venture to play;—while not one of the authors deserves more than a passing mention in a history of literature.

However, it may be worth while to consult the *Répertoire du* is far more impersonal even than it is regular. For the future every word will have its appointed place in the sentence, and will have to occupy that place; henceforth it is forbidden to place the subject after the verb, or the attribute before the subject! Further on he adds: "The literary language has been endowed with the utmost possible measure of order and clearness: a state of things which tends insensibly to make authors introduce wit into their utterances." This is the use to which he puts language himself, and his example encourages others to do likewise. He would have been nearer the truth had he said that authors are more concerned with achieving brilliancy, or spurious brilliancy, than any more sterling qualities. "It seems to me, my dear Sacy," writes Mme

Théâtre français for: Campistron's *Andronic*;—de la Fosse's *Manlius*;—and Lagrange-Chancel's *Amasis*;—and for Crébillon the edition of the *Collection des classiques Lefèvre*; or Vitu's edition mentioned above, Paris, 1885.

XII.—**Jean-Baptiste Rousseau** [Paris, 1671; † 1741, La Genette, near Brussels].

1. THE SOURCES.—Seguy, Notice preceding the edition of 1743;—Voltaire, *Vie de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau*, 1748;—Cizeron Rival, *Remarque sur les œuvres de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau*, 1760; La Harpe, *Cours de littérature*, part ii., ch. 9;—Amar, Notice preceding the edition of 1820;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, 1829, vol. i.

2. THE POET;—and in the first place of the uselessness of alluding to the man, who was a sorry personage;—but between whose life and works there is scarcely any connection;—a fact that in itself determines indirectly the nature of his lyricism.—Rousseau's "lyricism" is impersonal lyricism;—that is it is the very contrary of lyricism;—and nothing is more difficult than to account for his reputation.—His early and unsuccessful efforts at writing for the stage.—His paraphrases of the Psalms;—his Odes and Cantatas;—his Allegories.—How he endeavours to make up for his lack of personal sentiment,—by the irregular movements or contortions which the author of the *Art poétique* had seemed to declare were the essential characteristics

de Lambert to one of her friends, "*that in quoting Latin to you I overstep the bounds of modesty, and that I acquaint you with my secret excesses.*" However, it is at least possible to understand her, but what, will it be supposed, is the meaning of Massillon when he reproaches the great of this world "*with transporting into the field of the Lord what takes up room uselessly in their own field*"? His intention is to blame the great for making over to the Church the sons or daughters whom they are unable to provide with a portion. Mlle de Launay, more learned and clearer, writes in her Memoirs: "He used to offer me his hand to escort me home. We had to traverse a spacious square, and during the early period of our acquaintance he would make the round of its sides. Later he took to walking

of the ode;—by bombastic or declamatory language;—and by the piling up of mythological allusions [Cf. the *Ode au comte du Luc*:

Tel que le vieux pasteur du troupeau de Neptune,

and the *Cantate de Circé*:

Sa voix redoutable
Trouble les enfers,
Un bruit formidable
Gronde dans les airs].

Close connection between this false conception of lyricism and the vogue of opera;—a vogue which is also the explanation of the vagueness and generality of Rousseau's abstractions.—That this form of lyricism is merely the unconscious caricature of true lyricism;—since its principle is to feign emotions the writer does not feel;—and to invest those he does experience with a counterfeit elevation;—that is confined to the phraseology,—and has nothing in common with elevation of ideas or of sentiment.

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Rousseau consist of:—(1) his writings for the stage, including a short piece in prose, *Le Café*, performed in 1694;—two operas, *Jason*, 1696 and *Venus et Adonis*, 1697;—and five comedies in verse, of which, however, only two were put on the stage: *Le Flatteur*, 1696 and *Le Capricieux*, 1700;—(2) of his lyric poems, comprising four books of *Odes*, the first of which contains his paraphrases of the Psalms; two books of *Allégories* and

straight across the middle of it, and *I judged that his love had diminished by the difference between the diagonal and the two sides of the square*." Whatever may be the differences between these modes of expression, at bottom they all resemble one another; and are they not those at which Molière had been wont to scoff? They evince, however, a desire to please, and this desire explains a final characteristic of the transformation the language is undergoing: grown more logical and simpler in construction, easier to follow and livelier, it becomes at the same time more "social" or, if it be preferred, more "fashionable."

I have sometimes wondered whether this transformation should not be attributed in a measure to that resumption of the offensive on the part of Spanish influence which,

some twenty *Cantates*;—(3) of his other poems, namely, two books of *Epîtres*, four books of *Epigrammes*, the last of which contains nothing but gross obscenities, and a book of miscellaneous poems;—(4) of his Letters, in which some items of information touching literary matters can be gleaned here and there.

It is proper to add that between 1710 and 1820 few writers were so often reprinted as Jean-Baptiste Rousseau.

XIII.—Comedy from the time of Molière to that of Destouches.

1. The Sources.—[Cf. above, Article XI.] and in addition: Petitot, *Répertoire du Théâtre français*, vols. viii., ix., and x.—Gherardi, *Théâtre italien*;—Sainte-Beuve, *Regnard*, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vii.;—J. J. Weiss, *Éloge de Regnard*, 1859, in his *Essais sur l'histoire de la littérature françaises*;—Gilbert, *Regnard* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1859;—Edouard Fournier, Notice preceding his edition, Paris, 1874, 1875;—Notice on Dufresny preceding the edition of his works, Paris, 1747;—J. Lemaître, *Le Théâtre de Dancourt*, Paris, 1882.

2. The Transformation of Comedy.

A. Jean-François Regnard [Paris, 1655; † 1709, Grillon].

He was born and brought up in Paris;—his Epicurean existence;—his travels and adventures;—they form an unexpected justification of the endings to Molière's plays—Regnard's captivity in Algeria.—

between 1700 and 1714, coincided with, or rather was the result of, the accession to the throne of Charles V., of a grandson of Louis XIV. For this to be permissible, however, it would be necessary that the only man of real talent who shows signs of this influence—I refer to Le Sage—should not also be the only writer who scoffs at this new form of preciosity. In his *Diable boiteux*, which appeared in 1707, he merely makes passing allusions to the subject, but he returns to the attack in his *Gil Blas*, the date of the first part of which is 1714. With a boldness that recalls La Bruyère and Molière, he makes Mme de Lambert herself figure in his work under the name of the Marquise de Chaves. At a much later period, he has a final thrust at the fashionable affectation in the *Bachelier de Salamanque*,

His first plays at the Théâtre Italien: *Divorce*, 1688; *L'Homme à bonnes fortunes*, 1690; *Les Chinois* in collaboration with Dufresny, 1692;—his comedies of "character": the *Joueur*, 1696; the *Distrait*, 1697; *Démocrite*, 1700;—and how he endeavours in these works to imitate at the same time the methods of observation of Molière and those of La Bruyère.—His observation, however, lacks depth and strength;—not to say conscientiousness;—and it is obvious that he takes neither his subjects nor his art seriously;—It is for this reason that his real masterpieces:—the *Folies amoureuses*, 1704, and the *Légataire universel*, 1708,—are works of a different class;—in which, to the accompaniment of better constructed plots and a more rapid action, the characters of Italian comedy reappear;—clothed in the latest French fashion;—and speaking the language of the extremely free and easy world in which Regnard moved.—Regnard's style,—and whether it deserves the very high praise that has been bestowed on it?—His style is really vivacious, supple and brilliant;—qualities which are those of the language of his time as much as or more than they are his personally;—qualities which are met with in the *Crispin* or the *Diable boiteux* of Le Sage, 1707—or in the *Mémoires de Grammont*, 1713.

B. **Florent Carton Dancourt** [Fontainebleau, 1661; † 1725, Courcelles (Berry)].

The favourite pupil of Father de la Rue;—his youthful exploits;—

when he indulges in ironical praise of the "proconchi" dialect. "If you ask me what 'proconchi' is, I reply that it is a language which has its declensions and its conjugations, and that it can be learned as easily as the Latin language, more easily even, for it is a living language which it is possible to master in a short time by dint of conversing with Indian purists." It is a Spaniard who is speaking, and he continues: "It is an harmonious language, too, and even richer than our own in metaphors and high-flown figures of speech. Should an Indian who prides himself on speaking proconchi well decide to pay you a compliment, he will employ none but strange and unusual thoughts and far-fetched expressions. The result is an obscure, inflated utterance, a brilliant verbiage, a

he runs away with the daughter of the actor La Thorillière;—becomes an actor on her account;—makes his first appearance on the stage in 1685,—and as a dramatic author in 1686 with his comedy *Les Fonds perdus*.—This work is followed by the *Chevalier à la mode*, 1687;—the *Femme d'intrigues*, 1692;—the *Bourgeoises à la mode*, 1692;—and if these plays, which are all of them in prose, be considered in connection with such pieces of minor importance as:—the *Maison de campagne*, 1688;—the *Parisienne*, 1691;—or the *Gazette, impromptu de garnison*, 1692;—the rise is seen of a new stamp of comedy;—in which greater importance is attached to current events;—which is a more exact reflection of contemporary manners;—is less satirical and more jocose than the comedy of Molière.—which, in a word, is the comedy of manners.

Of the comedy of manners as exemplified in Dancourt's plays;—and in what respects it still remains faithful to the Molièresque traditions.—Thus it adopts the old, oft-used subjects and without any very great concern as to their "reality": for instance the befooled guardian [Cf. *Le Tuteur*, 1695;—the *Enfants de Paris*, 1699;—the *Trois Cousines*, 1700;—*Madame Artus*, 1708]—and the unmasked rogue [Cf. the *Chevalier à la mode*, 1687;—*L'Eté des coquettes*, 1690;—the *Femme d'intrigues*, 1692;—the *Agioteurs*, 1710].—But new features are to be distinguished amid these general resemblances.—Dancourt is in the habit of putting an entire social category on the stage,—as is indicated indeed by the fact that his titles are frequently in the plural [*Les* pompous rigmarole, but this is precisely what constitutes the excellence of the language. Such is the fashion at the Academy of Petapa." But the raillery of the worthy novelist, as happened in the past to that of La Bruyère and Molière, has no effect. Le Sage is endowed with wit, endowed with it indeed in abundance, and he has a fair amount of learning, which he is rather prone to display. Shall I venture to say that he is not very intelligent and that he is lacking in social polish? The reasons of the transformation that is in progress escape him, and not understanding it he scoffs at it, an attitude eminently French. But more circumspect critics look closer into the matter, and although they do not perceive, or they ill perceive, what will be the outcome of the transformation,

Enfants de Paris, *Les Bourgeoises à la mode*, *Les Agioteurs*.—Henceforth, to represent a given phase of character, several personages are introduced instead of a single personage as had previously been the custom;—and this scattering, as it were, of the satire results in its becoming more superficial;—though, on the other hand, it owes its "topicalness" to the same cause [Cf. the *Foire de Bezons*, 1695;—the *Moulin de Javelle*, 1696;—the *Loterie*, 1697;—the *Mari retrouvé*, 1698].—Subordination of the choice of subjects to topical, anecdotic incidents;—and of the quality of the humour to the exigences of fashion.

"Documentary" value of Dancourt's plays;—and, in this connection, of a paradox of Eugène Scribe [*Discours de réception*] to the effect that the stage is independent of manners.—The types of character in Dancourt's plays.—The world of finance [Cf. the *Femme d'intrigues*, 1692, or the *Agioteurs*, 1710].—The "demi-monde" or the world of shady morality [Cf. the *Chevalier à la mode*, 1687;—the *Bourgeoises à la mode*, 1692;—the *Femme d'intrigues*, 1692].—Comparison between Dancourt's plays and Le Sage's fiction.—The beginnings of realism;—and in what respect it differs from naturalism.—Dancourt's later plays: *Sancho Pança*, 1713;—the *Vert Galant*, 1714;—the *Prix de l'arquebuse*, 1717;—the *Déroute du Pharaon*, 1718.—The deficiencies which have prevented him leaving a profounder trace on the history of the French stage.

they are struck by two or three advantages it offers, and reserve their judgment.

Were they disposed to reply to the novelist, they would tax him in the first place with ingratitude, and without insisting on the classical reminiscences which are frequent in his own style to the detriment at times of its fluency, they would point out to him that he is the first to profit by the transformation at which he is pleased to scoff. French prose, after having been essentially *oratorical*, is becoming *narrative* at the close of the seventeenth century. Fifty or sixty years of the history of our literature will now elapse before we again meet with prose that is really eloquent. On the other hand, what writers of narrative prose had we had since the death of Marguerite and

C. **Charles Rivière-Dufresny** [Paris, 1648; † 1724, Paris].

Late period of his life at which Dufresny began to write.—He was one of the valets de chambre of Louis XIV.;—his passion for gardening and his dilettantism;—his collaboration with Regnard;—he begins writing for the Théâtre Italien: the *Opéra de campagne*, 1692;—the *Adieux des officiers*, 1693;—he writes for the *Théâtre français*: the *Négligent*, 1692;—the *Chevalier joueur*, 1697,—and whether Regnard was indebted to Dufresny for the idea?—The character of Dufresny would invite the belief that this is the case;—since he was "a man of ideas,"—and it seems probable that at a later period Montesquieu was indebted to him for the idea of the *Lettres persanes*;—another of Dufresny's ideas was to emancipate himself from the influence of Molière [Cf. the prologue to the *Négligent*];—and how far was he successful in this ambition?—His *Malade sans maladie*, 1699;—and his *Esprit de contradiction*, 1700.—That Dufresny depicts himself to some extent in this latter work.—His chief plays: the *Joueuse*, 1709;—the *Coquette de village*, 1715;—the *Réconciliation Normande*, 1719.—Studied novelty of the plot;—of the dialogue;—and even of the versification in Dufresny's plays.—Whether it can be said that there is already, as it were, a foretaste of Marivaux in his work?

3. THE WORKS.—Independently of his plays, Regnard has left accounts of his travels in Flanders, Lapland, Poland, and Germany;—a

Rabelais, or genuine "historical" writers since the time of Amyot? The name of Mme de Sévigné must not be cited here, because the first of her letters will not see the light before 1726. Bossuet himself, Bossuet indeed in particular, remains an orator while writing history—*in historia orator*—and unless higher value be set on La Fontaine's *Psyché* than ought to be done in our opinion, La Fontaine is only a narrative writer in his verse. In consequence, since Le Sage is assuredly one of the masters of the art of narrative among French writers, are we not justified in holding that he owes something at least of his superiority in the art to the new practices against which he yet protests? He would have been a less excellent narrator had he written some twenty years earlier. A circumstance that goes to prove this assertion is the spectacle of the

sort of novel *La Provençale*, which is the narrative of his adventures in Algeria;—and some miscellaneous poems, among which should be mentioned his *Satire contre les maris*, and the *Tombeau de M. Despréaux*.

The best or the finest edition of his works is that of 1790, Paris, V^{ve} Duchesne.

Dancourt's plays are his only works, and there exists no "critical" or even complete edition of them.

The best edition of Dufresny, and it is not very good, is that of 1747, the three first volumes of which contain his plays and the last volume a number of short pieces in prose, among which may be mentioned the *Amusements sérieux et comiques*;—a *Parallèle de Rabelais et d'Homère*;—and a dozen "Historical Stories," that resemble so many scenarios for vaudevilles or comedies.

XIV.—**Alain-René Le Sage** [Sarzeau (Morbihan), 1668; † 1747, Boulogne-sur-Mer].

1. THE SOURCES.—Gordon de Percel (Lenglet-Dufresnoy), *Bibliothèque des romans*;—La Harpe, *Cours de littérature*, part iii., book i., chapter v., section 4; chapter vii, section 2; and book ii., chapter iii.;—Malitourne, *Éloge de Le Sage*, and Patin, *Éloge de Le Sage*, preceding the edition of 1810–1823;—Audiffret, *Notice sur Le Sage* preceding the edition of 1822, Paris;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du*

narrative writers, his inferiors, who crop up around him in continually increasing numbers, from the author of the *Mémoires de Rochefort* and of *d'Artagnan*, whom we have already mentioned, to the author of *Fleur d'épine* and of the *Quatre Facardins*. And if the reason be sought of this progress of the narrative style, where will it be found if not in the new-born interest taken at this juncture in familiar and contemporary matters? It would not be easy and it would even be rather absurd to relate "oratorically" the adventures of Gil Blas; or how would it be possible to set forth the medical theories of Doctor Sangrado in stately and eloquent periods?

Simultaneously and for the same reason,—and this despite the authority of Fénelon, or whatever may be urged on the strength of his "Letter on the Occupations of the

lundi, vol. ii.; and *Jugements sur Gil Blas et Le Sage*, preceding the table of contents of the *Causeries du lundi*;—F. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, vol. iii.;—Léo Claretie, *Le Sage romancier*, Paris, 1890;—Lintilhac, *Le Sage*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, 1893.

François de Neufchâteau, *Examen de la question de savoir si Le Sage est l'auteur de Gil Blas*, 1818, and reprinted in Lefèvre's edition, Paris, 1820;—Llorente, *Observations critiques sur le roman de Gil Blas*, Paris, 1822;—Franceson, *Essai sur la question de l'originalité de Gil Blas*, Berlin, 1857;—Veckenstedt, *Die Geschichte des Gil Blas Frage*, Berlin, 1879.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Obscurity surrounding his early years;—his family difficulties;—and his start in literature; *Lettres galantes d'Aristénète*, 1695.—His relations with the Abbé de Lionne.—He publishes his *Théâtre espagnol*, 1700;—and *Don Quichotte*, a translation from the Spanish of Avellaneda.—His first play at the *Théâtre français*, 1707,—and his *Turcaret*, 1709.—In what respects *Turcaret* concentrates and summarises the novel features in Dancourt's plays;—although without swerving from the Molièresque tradition.—Why *Turcaret* was never a success;—and did Le Sage possess dramatic genius?—The farmers of the revenue endeavour to have the acting of *Turcaret* forbidden;—intervention of the Dauphin, the son of Louis XIV.;—Le Sage quarrels with the actors of the Théâtre Français;—and secedes, to spite them, to the Théâtre de la Foire.—

French Academy,"—the vocabulary is being enriched to a considerable extent. A few old-fashioned words drop out of use: withdrawn from circulation, they are no longer current coin. Their place is taken, however, by other and far more numerous words. "We have added a great many words," declares in 1718 the writer of the Preface to the second edition of the Dictionary of the Academy; and in another passage he makes the following observation which does not solely concern the language: "The Academy has not thought it right to exclude certain words to which the freaks of custom or perhaps of our manners . . . have given currency during the past few years. . . . It would seem, indeed, that there exists a sort of equality between the words of a language as between the citizens of a republic; they enjoy the same

---

Henceforth he devotes all his time not occupied by his novels to writing for this theatre.—The collaboration of Le Sage, d'Orneval, and Fuzelier;—and of the documentary interest attaching to the Théâtre de la Foire.—The *Diable boiteux*, 1707;—and *Gil Blas*, 1715, 1724, 1735.

A. *The elements which Le Sage's novels owe to his predecessors.*—The development of story writing between 1680 and 1700;—and the transition from the oratorical to the narrative style;—the abundance of Memoirs;—and the growth of the personal form of narrative.—What Le Sage owes to Le Bruyère;—and that in a certain sense the *Diable boiteux* is merely a series of portraits or characters [Cf. the old coquette, the old gallant, the German, the Frenchman, the schoolmaster, &c.].—Just as Dancourt did in his plays, the novelist seeks to arouse the interest of his readers by resorting to the "depiction of social classes";—and in this respect *Gil Blas* itself is merely a comedy.—The allusions to contemporary events in Le Sage's novels; —and whether, when he denies these allusions, he is more sincere than was the author of the *Caractères* under similar circumstances? —Le Sage's imitation of Spanish writers;—and, in this connection, of the picaresque novel [Cf. Ticknor, *Histoire de la littérature espagnole*, and Eug. de Navarrete in the collection of Spanish Classics (Ribadeneira)].—Le Sage's numerous borrowings;—and the puerility of the reproaches that have been addressed him on this score [Cf.

privileges and are governed by the same laws; and just as a general of an army or a magistrate are not citizens in a greater degree than a common soldier or the humblest artisan . . . so the words 'justice' and 'valour,' although they express the highest of all the virtues, are not French words in a greater degree or better French words than those destined to express the basest and most despicable things." Shall we cite some of these words? In the Preface itself are pointed out the words *Falbala*, *Fichu*, *Battant l'œil*, *Ratafia*, *Sabler*; as will be seen at once, they are popular or concrete terms in use in every-day life. Others of these new words are terms relating to the toilette, for example, or terms employed in the sciences—in mechanics, physics, or natural history. Their introduction is accompanied by the development of

Llorente, *loc. cit.*; Baret, *Littérature espagnole*; F. Brunetière, *Histoire et littérature*, vol. iii.; and Léo Claretie, *op. cit.*].

B. *The originality of Le Sage's novel*;—and that to judge of it, it is necessary of course to eliminate the subsidiary incidents which interrupt the main narrative [Cf. the love affairs of the Comte de Belflor and Léonor de Cespédés].—Where Le Sage has imitated the picaresque novel he has "humanised" it;—and that exactly what this means may be understood by comparing his *Gil Blas* with his translation of *Estevanille Gonzalez*, 1734.—The rogues' confessions to be found in the picaresque novels become in his hands a picture of human life;—and in the place of a succession of adventures devoid of significance, he gives us a satire on the social conditions of his time.—In other words, he considers what in his models is too exclusively peculiar to the individual under its universal aspect;—and in this way gives a moral import to incidents in themselves insignificant.

C. *The importance of Le Sage's novel*;—and that it lies in the fact that it is due to *Gil Blas* that the realistic novel became a branch of literature.—Coming after La Bruyère and resorting to analogous methods, Le Sage transferred the satire of manners from the stage to books;—and by so doing he struck out a genuinely new line.—It was his good fortune to determine the fundamental distinction between the stage play and the novel.—The hero of a novel is always the victim or the creature of circumstances;—and he resigns an interest in the things they designate. These things are made to serve for the drawing of fresh comparisons and as the source of new figures and metaphors. The whole of a vast province that hitherto had been outside literature is now incorporated with it. Words, too, are introduced from Holland, where they are coined by the newspapers to express ideas for which no term existed in France; while from England come yet other words which are not exactly English, but French words that had crossed the Channel as "refugees"—if the term be allowable. The plasticity of the French genius permits it to absorb and assimilate all these heterogeneous elements, to conform them to its exigences, and to subject them to the rules of French grammar. And what is the final outcome of this movement? It is—and the fact

himself to circumstances;—whereas the stage hero claims to dominate them.—The imitation of every-day life in Le Sage's novel;—and that neither the Spanish background, nor the continual aiming at satire result in the masking of its exactitude.—Comparison between the "fictitious" history in *Gil Blas* and the history proper of Dubois or Alberoni.—Of the nature of the incidents in Le Sage's novel;—and that there is nothing "romantic" about them,—so far as the word is synonymous with arbitrary or extraordinary.—The mistake sometimes made in this connection is the outcome of insufficient acquaintance with the private life of the time of Louis XIV. and the Regency.—Abundance of realistic touches in Le Sage's novel;—and how, as in Boileau's satires,—their excessiveness is always tempered by his literary training.—A strange remark of Nisard on Le Sage considered as a moralist;—and that there is nothing in common between Le Sage and Rollin except their abuse of Latin quotations.

The last works and the last years of Le Sage.—His translation, *Guzman d'Alfarache*, 1732;—his exotic novels: the *Aventures du chevalier de Beauchesne*, 1732;—and the *Bachelier de Salamanque*, 1736.—In the meantime he continues to write for the Théâtre de la Foire;—and on the stage as in the novel to satirise the classes of persons he most disliked, namely:—actors themselves;—financiers;—and the Précieux.—His literary opinions [Cf. in *Gil Blas* the conversations of Gil Blas with Fabrice; in the *Bachelier de Sala-*

must be insisted on—that while a more elevated, a graver, a more serious French may have been spoken previously, there has never been spoken a "prettier" French than that in use between 1685 and 1715 or thereabouts, a French more limpid, a French that is a closer transcript of thought, or at the same time a more concrete French. For proof it is only necessary to read Fontenelle and Le Sage, Mme de Lambert and Mlle de Launay, Regnard and Massillon. The truth is, the writers of this period are merely deficient in composition, in depth and in harmony, important qualities no doubt, but not always and everywhere indispensable, since their very absence was to contribute to the European vogue of our literature.

In reality what was happening was that, in proportion as the influence of royalty waned, "society" was

manque the thrusts at Mme de Lambert and the account of the Academy of Petapa; and Hönncher, *Die litterarische Satire Le Sage's*, Leipsic, 1886].—This realistic novelist is almost the last of the "classic" writers.—His protracted old age.—His last works: the *Valise trouvée*, 1740; and the *Mélange amusant*, 1743.—His influence in France and abroad.

3. THE WORKS.—They are composed, as has been seen:—(1) of his plays;—(2) of dramas, comedies, and picaresque novels translated from the Spanish;—(3) of his original novels: the *Diable boiteux*, *Gil Blas*, the *Aventures du chevalier de Beauchesne*, and the *Bachelier de Salamanque*;—(4) of the pieces he wrote in collaboration with Orneval and Fuselier for the Théâtre de la Foire [four volumes];—(5) and of some works written for the booksellers, among which may be mentioned his revision of the *Mille et un Jours* of Pétis de la Croix, the Orientalist.

The "definite" edition of *Gil Blas* is that of 1747 in four volumes.

The modern editions are innumerable.

Two good editions of the complete works are the edition of 1810–1823;—and Renouard's edition, Paris, 1820.

XV.—**Mme de Lambert's Salon.**

1. THE SOURCES.—*Lettres choisies de M. de la Rivière*, Paris, 1751;—Fontenelle, *Éloge de Mme de Lambert*;—the Memoirs of Mme de

recovering its independence, and far from the sovereign, far from the Court, "in the town"—to use the expression of the period—the *salons*, and with the *salons* women were reconquering their authority. Between 1660 and 1690 they had been excluded to a certain extent from literature and art—they had been kept a little in the shade. Now, however, that the aged King regards them with indifference, and awaiting the time when the Regent will treat them in the way that is notorious, they regain their natural influence, and as a prelude to the revels of Sceaux, the glories, thought to have vanished for ever, of the Hôtel de Rambouillet are revived in the *salon* of Mme de Lambert. Moreover, since lofty speculations rebut them, and they are rather afraid than otherwise of strenuous passions, authors tax their ingenuity to present

Staal-Delaunay, d'Argenson, and the President Hénault;—d'Alembert, *Éloges de Sacy, de Sainte-Aulaire, de la Motte*;—Sainte-Beuve, *Mme de Lambert, Causeries du lundi*, vol. iv.;—Desnoiresterres, *Les cours galantes*;—Ch. Giraud, *La Maréchale de Villars*, Paris, 1881;—Lescure's study preceding his edition of the works of Mme de Lambert, Paris, 1882;—Emmanuel de Broglie, *Les mardis et les mercredis de la Marquise de Lambert*, in the *Correspondant*, April 10 and 25, 1895.

2. THE REVIVAL OF PRECIOSITY;—and that, as at its first appearance, it is to be regarded as a protest on the part of the women against coarseness of language;—indecency of manners;—and the tendency towards naturalism.—Anne-Marie Thérèse de Marguenat de Courcelles, Marquise de Lambert [1647, † 1773];—her youth;—her marriage and her early writings.—Her "correspondence" with Fénelon.—The *Avis d'une mère à son fils* and the *Avis d'une mère à sa fille*.—Mme de Lambert takes up her residence at the Hôtel de Nevers, 1698 [to-day the Bibliothèque Nationale];—and assigns herself the rôle of patroness of letters.—Her "Tuesdays" and "Wednesdays."—As formerly at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, men of letters mingle at her receptions with noblemen,—actresses [Cf. *Lettres d'Adrienne Lecouvreur*, edited by M. G. Monval, Paris, 1892];—and ladies of high birth [Cf. Giraud, *La Maréchale de Villars*].—However, a greater freedom of tone prevails than at the earlier *salon*;—or

such matters to them under an amusing form; while they, for their part, rid the language of all trace of pedantry and strip thought itself of the sort of pride on which it fed in solitude. And it is for these reasons that this thought and this language become the most faithful image that exists of the French genius, admitting this genius to be, as we have endeavoured to show is the case, the genius of "sociability." The authors of the period have the public, and the public only, in view in their writings. They write to amuse their fellow-men, to please them, to win their applause—and to a slight extent to instruct them. Whatever be the author's extraction, in whatever rank of society he may have been born, whatever conception he may have of his parts, his first care is to determine the relations

a freedom of a different kind;—and the conversations had a wider range.

3. **The Great Men of Mme de Lambert's Salon.** — Antoine Houdar de la Motte [1672, † 1731]. [Cf. the Abbé Trublet, *Mémoires sur M. de la Motte*, and d'Alembert, *Éloge de La Motte*].—His triumphs at the opera: *L'Europe galante*, 1697; *Issé*, 1698; *Amadis de Grèce*, 1699.—His *Odes*, 1706, and his *Fables*, 1719.—His *Discours sur Homère*, 1714;—and Mme Dacier's rejoinder: *Des causes de la corruption du goût*.—Mme de Lambert's intervention in the quarrel. —The entire Salon sides with the Moderns;—and as it was held to represent both polite manners and good taste,—the opposition of literary opinion to the Ancients is consummated.—Other works of La Motte.—His tragedies: the *Macchabées*, 1721;—*Romulus*, 1722;—*Inès de Castro*, 1723.—La Motte scores further successes with his "academical speeches";—and becomes the literary oracle of Mme de Lambert's salon. [Cf. Paul Dupont, *Houdar de la Motte*, Paris, 1898].

4. **The Formation of Public Opinion.**—The mixture of men of culture and business men in the salon of the Hôtel de Nevers results in the formation of a public opinion.—Mme de Lambert becomes the "Great Electress" of the French Academy;—to the increase of her own influence and that of the Academy.—This result is promoted by the indifference of the authorities;—and also by the growing disorder.—

between his personality and the ideas of his time and to put himself in accordance with them. In no other way are literary vogue, authority, glory or reputation to be acquired. This attitude is one way of understanding literature, and we have just reviewed its advantages. But may it not be that these advantages are counterbalanced by drawbacks? This is the point we shall examine in the following chapter.

The court, which has ceased to direct opinion, is blind to the significance of the movement in progress.—Budding talent no longer looks to Versailles for definite recognition ;—but to the salon of Mme de Lambert. —While Fontenelle and La Motte reign over the salon, Marivaux and Montesquieu are its new recruits.—With their appearance on the scene ;—and that of the Abbé Saint-Pierre [Cf. G. de Molinari, *L'abbé de Saint-Pierre*, Paris, 1857 ; and Goumy, *Étude sur la vie et les écrits de l'abbé de Saint-Pierre*, Paris, 1859] ;—begins the discussion of " serious subjects " ;—and the sway of the salons and the authority of the intellect are founded simultaneously.

CHAPTER III

THE DEFORMATION OF THE CLASSIC IDEAL

I

Despite what has been said in support of the contention, literature is not always "the expression of society," but when once it has become so, it is doubtless only natural for its destinies to follow the fortunes of the society of which it is the expression. As has just been

THE AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

SEVENTH PERIOD

From the "Lettres Persanes" to the publication of the "Encyclopedia"

1722–1750

I.—**Charles de Secondat, Baron de la Brède et de Montesquieu** [Château de la Brède, near Bordeaux, 1689; † 1755, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Maupertuis, *Éloge de Montesquieu*, 1755;—d'Alembert, *Éloge du Président du Montesquieu*, 1755, in the 5th vol. of the Encyclopedia;—Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, in the *Catalogue des Ecrivains*, 1756; his article *Esprit des Lois* in his *Dictionnaire philosophique*, 1771; and *Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Lois*, 1777;—Villemain, *Éloge de Montesquieu*, 1816;—Garat, *Mémoires historiques sur la vie de M. Suard*, 1820;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vii., 1852;—Louis Vian, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Montesquieu*, Paris, 1879;—Albert Sorel, *Montesquieu* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1887.

seen, this is what is beginning to happen to literature in the early years of the reign of Louis XV., and the process is consummated during the same period.

Freed from or rid of the Protestants, Jansenism and Louis XIV., the "Libertines" gain ground unceasingly and become the leaders and masters of opinion. "There may have been ungodly persons in the past,—exclaims Massillon in his *Petit Carême,*—but the world regarded them with horror. . . . To-day, however, *ungodliness almost lends an air of distinction and glory;* it is a merit that gives access to the great, *that adds lustre, as it were, to humbleness of name and birth*, that procures for obscure men the privilege of familiarity with the people's princes." [Cf. *Petit Carême*, third sermon "On the respect due to religion."] The people's princes are the Vendôme family, unless—for we are in 1718—the

Bertolini, *Analyse raisonnée de l'Esprit des Lois*, 1754, printed too in vol. iii. of Laboulaye's edition;—d'Alembert, *Analyse de l'Esprit des Lois*, 1755, printed too in Parrelle's edition;—Crévier, *Observations sur le livre de l'Esprit des Lois*, 1764;—Destutt de Tracy, *Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Lois*, Philadelphia, 1811; and 1819, Paris;—Sclopis, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur l'Esprit des Lois*, Turin, 1857;—Laboulaye, *Introduction à l'Esprit des Lois*, Paris, 1876.

See, too, Auguste Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive*, vols. v. and vi., Paris, 1842;—Ernest Bersot, *Etudes sur le XVIII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1855;—J. Barni, *Histoire des idées morales et politiques en France au XVIII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1865;—P. Janet, *Histoire de la science politique*, Paris, 1858; and 2nd edit., 1872;—Robert Flint, *The Philosophy of History in France*;—H. Taine, *L'ancien régime*, Paris, 1875;—Emile Faguet, *Dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, 1890.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Montesquieu's extraction;—he was a Gascon, of good birth, and a magistrate.—He enters the Parliament of Bordeaux, 1714;—and in succession to one of his uncles he is appointed President of the Bordeaux Court of Justice, 1716.—Interesting analogy between the beginning of his career and the beginning of Montaigne's career.—Montesquieu's early works; their scientific character;—his "Discourse on the cause of echoes," 1718; and on

allusion be to Philippe d'Orléans himself; and the obscure men whose "low estate is ennobled" by the profession of atheism or libertinism are also known to us: they are the wits who assemble at the Café Procope or the Café Gradot, and among them is the "little Arouet," as he is called, who the previous year was imprisoned in the Bastille. If they have not their entry into society as yet, it will soon be given them, and to deserve it they adopt, or rather they have already adopted, society manners. They are met with in the *salons*, in that of Mme de Lambert for instance, and in these resorts the freedom of their conversation beguiles the idleness of the women and the careless humour of the men. They even find their way into the boudoirs, and there as well their wit is triumphant over social prejudices. In the meantime, and until they form a sort of corpo-

---

the "Functions of the renal glands," 1718;—and that traces of this scientific culture will be met with in the *Esprit des Lois*.—Strangeness of his literary tastes;—his admiration for the tragedies of Crébillon, "which, he declares, make him enter into transports akin to those of the Bacchantes";—he publishes his *Lettres persanes*, 1721–1722.

A. The *Lettres persanes*;—and in the first place the bibliographical question;—Pierre Marteau of Cologne and his spurious editions.—The works that suggested the *Lettres persanes*;—and that it is doing Dufresny too much honour to assert that they were solely suggested by his *Amusements sérieux et comiques*.—The truth is Montesquieu was influenced, as much as by Dufresny, by the *Caractères* of La Bruyère and the *Diable boiteux* of Le Sage;—by Fénelon's *Télémaque* [Cf. the episode of the Troglodytes];—by the books of travel of Tavernier and Chardin;—and even by the Arabian Nights.—Regrettable dwelling on the intrigues of the harem in the *Lettres persanes*; and that Montesquieu will never renounce the depiction of scenes of this nature [Cf. his *Temple de Gnide*; *Arsace et Isménie*, etc.].—The satire of contemporary manners in the *Lettres persanes* [Cf. in particular *Lettres* 48, 57, 72, 143, etc.];—and that it strikes far deeper than the satire of Le Sage or Le Bruyère [Cf. 24, 29, 44, 68, etc.].—The last portion of the book—and of the singular importance the rate body, or almost a State within the State, the rich and persons of good birth are at first a little astonished, and affect to be galled, but they do not take real umbrage, and reconcile themselves in the end to being treated with the unrestraint and pleasant impertinence they themselves in the past had shown the newcomers.

It must be kept in view in this connection that for several years previously a curious mixing up of social ranks and fortunes has been in progress. "The corporation of lackeys—writes Montesquieu in his *Lettres persanes* in 1721—is more respectable in France than elsewhere; it fills up the vacancies in the other classes. Those who compose it take the places of the great who fall upon evil days, and when they cannot do this in person they reinvigorate the great families by means of their daughters, who serve in some sort as the manure

author ascribes in it, long before Malthus, to the population question [Cf. 113 to 123].—His perpetual comparisons between Europe and Asia.—Great success of the *Lettres persanes*;—Montesquieu resigns his post of President, 1726;—he enters the French Academy, 1728;—and undertakes a series of journeys,—in the course of which he becomes acquainted with almost the whole of civilised Europe, 1728–1731 [Cf. *Voyages de Montesquieu*, Paris and Bordeaux, 1892, 1894, 1896].—He takes up his residence on his property at Brède;—and publishes his *Considérations* in 1734.

B. The *Considérations sur les Causes de la grandeur et de la décadence des Romains*.—What was Montesquieu's intention in writing this work;—and whether it should not perhaps be regarded as a "fragment" of the *Esprit des Lois*;—or whether the author really proposed to vie "with Tacitus and with Florus"?—Montesquieu's predilection for Florus [Cf. his *Essai sur le goût*];—and generally for the Latins of the decadence;—a predilection which does not prevent him blaming Livy "for having belauded the giants of antiquity."—Comparison between Montesquieu's book and the third part of the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*;—and to what extent it was Montesquieu's intention to combat Bossuet.—His theory of the causes;—and his philosophy of history.

with which mountainous and arid land is improved" [Cf. *Lettres persanes*, No. 99]. La Bruyère had made a somewhat similar remark in his *Caractères*. The second part of *Gil Blas* should be read in the same connection. Its date is 1725, and in it figures a lackey who becomes the arbiter of the Spanish monarchy "by dint of filling disgraceful posts." As to any hesitation there may be to ascribe "documentary" value, political significance, or social import to this novel, it will be lessened when it is remembered that the effective masters of Europe on the eve of its appearance were a Dubois, the son of the apothecary of Brive-la-Gaillarde, or an Alberoni, the son of a gardener of Parma! The *Lettres historiques et galantes* of Mme Dunoyer or the Memoirs of Saint-Simon should also be consulted on the point. It is of special importance, however, to bear in mind

C. The *Esprit des Lois*.—The bond of union between the *Lettres persanes* and the *Esprit des Lois*;—and in what sense it may be said that in reality Montesquieu has only written one work.—Of the plan of the book;—and that it must be that it is not clear;—since every one of Montesquieu's commentators gives a different explanation of it.—That Montesquieu's real ambition was to write a great book;—in which he was only half successful.—Indefiniteness of his plan;—regrettable trend of his humour;—Inadequacy or triflingness of his criticism [Cf. Voltaire's commentary].—Of certain errors he was pleased to let subsist in his book [Cf. bk. vii., ch. 16; bk. xv., ch. 4; bk. xxi., ch. 22];—and what can have been his reasons for not correcting them?—What was Sainte-Beuve's meaning when he declared "that Montesquieu's works were scarcely more than an ideal recapitulation of his reading";—and that the statement amounts to saying that they are deficient in order and logic.—Of Mme du Deffand's remark on the *Esprit des Lois*;—and that it well characterises the defects of Montesquieu's manner.—But that all these criticisms do not do away with the fact that Montesquieu brought an entire order of ideas into the domain of literature, which before had not formed part of it;—that he was the first to outline a philosophy of history conceived from a purely lay point of view;—that he arrived the upheaval wrought in social conditions by the system of Law, 1716–1721, nothing similar to which had previously been known. "All those who were wealthy six months ago are now in poverty, and those who lacked bread are now overflowing in riches. . . . This foreigner has turned society inside out as a dealer in old clothes turns a coat. . . . What unhoped for fortunes have been witnessed, fortunes incredible even to those who have made them! God himself does not bring men into existence more rapidly out of the void. How numerous are the valets served by their comrades, and to-morrow perhaps by their masters!" [Cf. *Lettres persanes*, No. 138]. The words are again those of Montesquieu, who, though doubtless he was a satirist, was a serious man and a magistrate. Like the froth in a boiling mixture, the dregs of society rise to the surface in this way, overspread

at an inkling of the analogies between history and natural history;—and, from a more general point of view, that he gave eloquent expression to ideas,—on liberty,—on tolerance,—and on humanity—which even at the present time are not so commonplace and so prevalent as is alleged.—Success of the *Esprit des Lois* both in France and abroad;—and whether the defects of the book did not contribute to its success to as great an extent as its qualities?

Montesquieu's lesser writings: the *Temple de Gnide*, 1725;—the *Voyage à Paphos*, 1727;—the dialogue between Sylla and Eucrates, 1745; *Lysimaque*, 1751–1754;—*Arsace et Isménie*, 1754;—and the *Essai sur le goût*, 1757.—Of the qualities of Montesquieu's style;—and that it is a kindred style to that of Fontenelle;—although graver, richer, and more compact;—and, in this connection, of Montesquieu's preciosity.—Of the art of and the capacity for conceiving general ideas;—and that they constitute another pre-eminent characteristic of Montesquieu's style;—as does the power of expressing in a few words not only many things,—but many different things, and in consequence many relations between things.—Montesquieu's last years.—He is on intimate terms with Mme de Tencin and Mme Geoffrin [Cf. Marmontel's Memoirs, and P. de Ségur, *Le royaume de la rue Saint-Honoré*, Paris, 1897].—His unique it and remain at the top. A new aristocracy is in course of formation, an aristocracy of doubtful or impure origin, crassly ignorant, cynical and of loose morals, but refined in its tastes and assuredly unable to reproach the men of letters with their humble extraction, since of the brothers Pâris or of the little Arouet it is the latter who is the "better born."

Amid this general confusing of the classes, or rather in consequence of it, the influence of women continues to increase, and with the Marquise de Prie, under the Ministry of the Duc de Bourbon (1723–1726) it extends to affairs of State for the first time for a century. Mme de Lambert only made Academicians; the Marquise de Prie makes a Queen of France, Mme de Tencin cardinals and ambassadors. "There is nobody—writes Montesquieu—in possession of a post at the court in Paris or

position in the literary world;—and in the European opinion of his time.

3. THE WORKS.—Montesquieu's principal works have been mentioned above. It remains to add a hundred and fifty or a hundred and sixty (exactly 152 in Laboulaye's edition) letters;—and three volumes of Unpublished Works issued by Baron de Montesquieu [Paris and Bordeaux, 1892, 1894, 1896].

The principal edition of Montesquieu, independently of the original editions which it is well to consult, at any rate in the case of the *Lettres persanes* and the *Esprit des Lois*, are:—Parrelle's edition in the "Collection des Classiques français" series, Paris, 1826, Lefèvre;—and Laboulaye's edition, Paris, 1875–1879, Garnier.

II.—**Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux** [Paris, 1688; † 1763, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—D'Alembert, *Éloge de Marivaux*, 1785; Marmontel's Memoirs;—Geoffroy, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, 1825, vol. iii.;—Sainte-Beuve, *Marivaux* in the *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix., 1854;—Edouard Fournier, *Étude sur Marivaux*, preceding his edition of the *Théâtre complet*, Paris, 1878;—Lescure, *Éloge de Marivaux*, Paris, 1880;—Jean Fleury, *Marivaux et le Marivaudage*, Paris, 1881;

in the provinces who has not a woman who distributes all the favours it is in his power to bestow and who sometimes commits the injustices he is able to perpetrate"; and naturally this "woman" is not his wife. In consequence, it is necessary henceforth that whoever desires to make his way in the world shall have the women on his side, shall possess the gift of pleasing them and of interesting them in his fortunes or his reputation. The writers of the period are alive to this necessity; and it must be admitted that although their complaisancy is not without its dangers—the least of which is to make them, as were their predecessors the Précieux, the servants or the courtiers of fashion—it results in the first place in an advantage. "The somewhat volatile and inconstant French character, chilled by convention and artificiality, seems to gain in warmth to a sensible extent" [Cf.

—G. Larroumet, *Marivaux, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1882;—F. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, vol. ii. and vol. iii., 1881 and 1883; and *Époques du théâtre français*, 1892;—G. Deschamps, *Marivaux* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1897.

2. The Writer.—Marivaux' family.—His early education;—the society in which he moved in Paris at first;—his early protectors or literary patrons: Fontenelle and La Motte.—His tragedy *Annibal*.—His first novel: *Pharsamon ou les folies romanesques*, 1712;—and how Marivaux, considered as a Précieux, goes back to the *Grand Cyrus* and to *Polexandre*.—His contempt for antiquity: the *Iliade travestie*, 1716;—and, in this connection, of the peculiarly spiteful character of Marivaux' parodies.

A. *The Novelist*.—His *Effets suprenants de la sympathie*, 1713–1714;—the *Voiture embourbée*, 1714;—and, in this connection, of the poverty of Marivaux' imagination;—the *Vie de Marianne*, 1731–1741; and the *Paysan parvenu*, 1735–1736.—Essential characteristics of Marivaux' novels.—They are realistic novels as far as regards: the social status of the personages,—who are usually middle-class or lower middle-class;—the simplicity of the plot;—and the faithfulness with which they depict every-day life. In the second place they are psychological novels;—whose principal interest lies solely in the

Michelet, *Histoire de France ; Louis XV.*] ; and thanks to the women, and with a view to their conquest, *sensibility* is emancipated from the strict and suspicious tutelage in which it had been kept by the masters of the preceding age.

Timidly at first, but soon with growing boldness, it is seen to show itself, to attempt its first exploits in the comedies of Marivaux :—the *Jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, 1730 ; the *Serments indiscrets*, 1732 ; the *Mère confidente*, 1735 ; the *Fausses confidences*, 1737,—in a dozen other plays which not only revenge women for the slights of Molière, but bring comedy under the control of their sex, firmly establish this control and ensure its lasting maintenance. Of a surety there is wit, indeed too much wit, there is studied elegance and subtlety, and there is excessive refinement of ideas and expression (*marivaudage*) in

analysis of sentiment ;—the adventures in them being of slight importance ;—so slight indeed even in the eyes of the author himself, that *Marianne* and the *Paysan* remained unfinished.—Finally they are novels if not of love at any rate of gallantry ;—which distinguishes them from Le Sage's novels.—Whether, too, they are as " decent " and as moral as has been alleged ?—Comparison in this respect between *Gil Blas* and the *Paysan*.—Of Marivaux' curious predilection for domestic servants.

B. *The Dramatic Author* ;—and that his threefold originality consists in :—his having ceased to follow in the footsteps of Molière ;—his having transported the tragedy of Racine into ordinary life ;—and his having made his plots turn more especially on the transformation of the sentiments : the *Double inconstance*, 1723 ;—the *Seconde surprise de l'amour*, 1728 ;—the *Jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, 1730 ;—the *Faussess confidences*, 1737 ;—the *Epreuve*, 1740.—The criticisms of his contemporaries and Marivaux's rejoinder.—" All his pieces turn on the delivery of lovers from a predicament in which they are involved by false pride, timidity, the difficulty of coming to an explanation, or social inequalities."—Importance of the women's parts in Marivaux' plays.—The originality that accrues to his pieces from the importance of the women's parts as seen in :—the curtailing of the rôle the masterpieces of Marivaux: where else would these characteristics be looked for if not in his plays? His comedies, too, are marked by a coldness, and even by an irony, which he seems to have inherited from Fontenelle, his friend and master. Still, sensibility is the soul of his writings, even though it does not occupy the entire place in them; for if there be one quality it is impossible to deny the Aramintas and Silvias of this gallant man, it is assuredly that of being what is called "touching." Voltaire's *Zaïre* (1732) and his "American" *Alzire* (1736) are more than touching: they are pathetic. As a good judge has well remarked [Cf. A. Vinet, *Littérature française au XVII*^{e} *siècle,* vol. ii. pp. 24, 37], it is insufficient to say that their adventures stir our feelings: they positively distress us. In this respect—as in several others—Voltaire's tragedies are as

played by satire;—the increased importance accorded the sentimental element in the very conception of comedy;—and the revolution in matters theatrical that is the necessary consequence of these features. —Marivaux' comedies and Watteau's pictures.—Marivaux and Shakespeare;—and that together with the vaguely poetic background and the Italian names,—what is most Shakespearian in Marivaux,—is perhaps the "marivaudage."—"Marivaudage" and "Euphuism."—Marivaux' preciosity, however, does not prevent him being often somewhat blunt;—and even at times coarse.—The *Jeu de l'amour et du hasard* and Victor Hugo's *Ruy Blas.*

C. *The Publicist.*—A remark of Sainte-Beuve touching "certain serious sides of Marivaux' mind";—and that evidence of them must be sought for in his "papers."—The *Spectateur français*, 1722–1723; —and that the idea of this production is evidently taken from Addison's *Spectator.*—The *Indigent philosophe*, 1728, and the *Cabinet du philosophe*, 1734.—Borrowings from these works made by the author of the *Neveu de Rameau* and that of the *Mariage de Figaro* [Cf. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, vol. iii.].—Of certain of Marivaux' ideas;—on criticism;—on the organisation of a literary "marshalship";—on the status of women and on the education of children;—on the inequality of human conditions.—To what extent did Marivaux much superior to those of Crébillon or La Motte, as Marivaux' comedies are superior to those of Destouches or even of Regnard. And after making allowance for the "romantic" and the "melodramatic" elements in Voltaire's creations, is it going too far to say that after a lapse of a hundred and fifty years his *Alzire*, and more especially his *Zaïre*, still make us shed real tears? But there is another poet who causes the shedding of yet more abundant tears: we refer to the author of *Manon Lescaut*, 1731; of *Cleveland*, 1733; of the *Doyen de Killerine*, 1735, to the kindly, soft-hearted, sentimental Abbé Prévost. Tempered or restrained in the case of Marivaux by a certain dread of ridicule, and mingled in Voltaire's tragedies with other novelties, sensibility overflows in Prévost's novels. It is the sole source both of their inspiration and of their attractiveness. A superficial observer of the manners of his time,

himself takes his ideas seriously?—and how his work paved the way for the generation to which Vauvenargues and Rousseau belonged.

3. THE WORKS.—Marivaux' works comprise:—

(1) His short writings, of which we have just mentioned the principal, and to which may be added, with a view to making the enumeration sufficiently complete, sundry articles written for the *Mercure*.

(2) His plays, of which there are thirty-two in all, the principal being: *Arlequin poli par l'amour*, 1720;—*La surprise de l'amour*, 1722;—*La double inconstance*, 1723;—*Le prince travesti*, 1724;—*La seconde surprise de l'amour*, 1728;—*Le jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, 1730;—*Les serments indiscrets*, 1732;—*L'heureux stratagème*, 1733;—*La Mère confidente*, 1735;—*Le legs*, 1736;—*Les fausses confidences*, 1737;—*L'épreuve*, 1740;—and *Le préjugé vaincu*, 1746.

(3) His novels: *Pharsamon*, 1712, but not published till 1737;—the *Effets surprenants de la sympathie*, 1713–1714;—the *Voiture embourbée*, 1714;—the *Vie de Marianne*, in eleven parts, 1731–1741 [The twelfth part, which is not found in all editions, is by Mme Riccoboni];—and the *Paysan parvenu*, in five parts, 1735–1736. There remain for mention the *Iliade travestie*, 1716, and the *Télémaque travesti*, 1736.

a copious, fluent, and harmonious, but an unequal and negligent writer, Prévost's chief originality and bond of union with his readers lies in the readiness with which his feelings are stirred by his own imaginings; they interest him, they trouble him profoundly. He weeps, he is an adept at weeping—if the expression be allowable; and his whole century starts weeping with him.

This incursion of sensibility into literature deals the classic ideal a second, a serious and a profound blow: the first, as we have seen, proceeded from the renunciation of tradition. For while it is impossible, as has been rightly observed, "to make languages that are perpetually changing the vehicle of anything that is eternal" [Cf. Bossuet, *Discours de réception*], it is equally true that that character of eternity which is the very condition or the definition of the work of art cannot be conferred on what itself is

The best edition of Marivaux, or up to now the most complete edition, for it is not particularly good, is the edition of 1781 in 12 volumes, Paris, Vve Duchesne.

III.—**Antoine-François Prévost d'Exiles** [Hesdin, 1697; † 1763, St. Firmin, near Chantilly].

1. The Sources.—Prévost's own novels, and in particular: the *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité*; *Cléveland*; and the *Histoire de M. de Montcal* [Cf. too his journal: *Le Pour et Contre*].—Bernard d'Héry's Notice preceding the editions of 1783 and 1810;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vols. i. and iii.; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix., 1853;—Ambroise Firmin-Didot, article Prévost in the *Biographie universelle*;—A. de Montaiglon's biographical notice at the end of Glady frères' edition of *Manon Lescaut*, 1875, Paris;—F. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, vol. iii.;—Henry Harrisse, *l'Abbé Prévost*, 1896, Paris;—and the Notices preceding various editions of *Manon Lescaut*, notably those by Alexandre Dumas fils and Guy de Maupassant.

2. The Man and the Novelist.—His adventurous youth.—Jesuit, soldier, and Benedictine, 1721.—He helps with the *Gallia christiana*.—He leaves the Benedictines, 1728;—publishes the first part of the

changeable; and what is more changeable than the sensibility of one man with regard to another, or of the same man at different moments? Who was it declared in this connection that sensibility "being a disposition that accompanies organic weakness, that results from the mobility of the diaphragm, from the vivacity of the imagination, from the sensitiveness of the nerves, a disposition which inclines us to sympathise, to be thrilled, to fear, to admire, to weep, to faint, to succour, to cry aloud, to take to flight, to lose our reason, to have no exact idea of the true, the good, and the beautiful, to be unjust, to be mad," that sensibility, for all these reasons, was merely the "characteristic of a kindly nature and of a mediocre genius"? It was Diderot who made this declaration in a moment of frankness [Cf. his *Paradoxe sur le comédien*]; and the fact is that it seems that sensibility, left free to

Mémoires d'un homme de qualité, 1728;—and visits England;—and afterwards Holland [Cf. *Memoires du Chevalier de Ravannes*, and *Mélanges de Bois-Jourdain*].—The first edition of *Manon Lescaut*, 1731 or 1733?—He returns to France.—Publication of *Cleveland*, 1731; —*Le Pour et le Contre*, 1733.—Prévost writes for the booksellers;— *Le Doyen de Killerine*, 1735.—He becomes "almoner to the Prince de Conti."

These details help to an understanding of Prévost's novels:—he may truthfully be said to have lived his works;—the desultory character of which is explained by the hasards of his existence;—moreover, such of his work as he did not "live," he "felt" rather than "imagined."—The sombre and melancholic character of Prévost's novels;—and how greatly they differ from the novels of Le Sage and Marivaux.—The passion of love in Prévost's novels;—how they are almost exclusively occupied with it;—and that it offers in them the same features of suddenness;—violence;—and fatality as in Racine's tragedies.—It is this circumstance that constitutes the conspicuous merit of *Manon Lescaut*, and not the fact that the novel is a sketch of the courtesan.—The depiction of manners in Prévost's novels; —and how insignificant or superficial it is.—Prévost's novels are idealist novels;—moreover, they are not in the least degree pursue the impetuous irregularity of its course, has never produced in any age or in any branch of literature work that is other than inferior or of secondary importance. The novels of Prévost himself or the comedies of De la Chaussée [*La Fausse antipathie*, 1733; *Le préjugé à la mode*, 1735; *Mélanide*; *La gouvernante*] may serve as excellent examples in point! If the reason of this be asked, it is again Diderot who furnishes it when he remarks that "the man whose sensibility is highly developed is too much at the mercy of his diaphragm . . . to be a profound observer of and in consequence a sublime imitator of nature." Here, indeed, we have a man who knows himself! What we see through a cloud of tears,—he is entirely in the right!—is indistinct, confused, and uncertain, and one of the first effects of this untrammelled indulgence in sensibility is to modify pro-

psychological;—and their style is that proper to passion;—that is to say, it rises at times to the highest eloquence;—and descends in places to the lowest depths of the commonplace;—while it is always easy, harmonious, copious, and prolix.

Prévost's last years;—and his rôle of intermediary between the literatures of England and France;—his translations of Richardson: *Paméla*, *Clarisse*, *Grandison*;—of Hume's History of England;—and of Middleton's Life of Cicero.—He writes for the *Journal étranger*;—and is one of the authors of the *Histoire générale des voyages*.—His relations with Rousseau;—and that he and Marivaux are the only men of letters to whom sympathetic allusion is made in the *Confessions*;—natural reasons for this sympathy;—and the interest of this remark.—Of certain information respecting Prévost's novels;—and in particular that furnished by Mlle Aïssé;—and by Mlle de Lespinasse.—The legend of Prévost's death [Cf. Henry Harrisse, *L'Abbé Prévost*].

3. THE WORKS.—The works of Prévost are composed of his novels, among which we will mention:—the *Mémoires d'un homme de qualité*, of which *Manon Lescaut* forms the seventh part, 1728, 1731;—the *Histoire de M. Cleveland*, 1731;—the *Doyen de Killerine*, 1735–1740;—the *Histoire d'une Grecque moderne*, 1740;—the *Campagnes*

foundly the observation of nature, and the nature of this observation.

The great writers of the preceding generation had not foreseen that the consequence of making a certain social tendency a constituent part of the classic ideal would one day be to cause the realisation of beauty and the imitation of nature to be held of less account than the pleasing the fashionable world, or than considerations of social utility! This, however, is what happens. The *psychological and moral observation*, which for a hundred and fifty years had been the basis or the pedestal of the classic ideal, gives place to *social observation.* "Man is in no way an enigma, as you imagine him to be in order to have the pleasure of solving it. . . . There is no more apparent contradiction in man than in the rest of nature. . . . What intelligent man is there who will be filled with despair because he is

philosophiques ou les Mémoires de M. de Montcal, 1741;—and the *Mémoires d'un honnête homme*, 1745.

He also wrote almost the whole of *Pour et Contre*, 1733–1740;—further he translated or adapted all of Richardson's work, several volumes of Hume, etc.;—and wrote, it is said, the first 17 volumes of the *Histoire générale des voyages*, 1745–1761.

There exist two editions of Prévost's works, joined to those of Le Sage, and forming in all 54 volumes, 39 of which are occupied by Prévost's writings. These editions were issued in Paris in 1783 and in 1810–1816.

The editions of *Manon Lescaut* are innumerable.

IV.—**Pierre Claude Nivelle de la Chaussée** [Paris, 1691 or 1692; † 1754, Paris].

1. The Sources.—D'Alembert, *Éloge de La Chaussée*;—Geoffroy, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, vol. iii.;—Lanson, *Nivelle de la Chaussée et la comédie larmoyante*, Paris, 1887.

2. The Origin of the "Middle-class" Drama.—La Chaussée's first successful work: *La fausse antipathie*, 1733;—and that his fresh departure consisted less in his having "mixed" the branches of the drama,—Marivaux having already done that in his comedies,—than in

acquainted with only some few of the attributes of matter?" [Voltaire, Beuchot's edition, vol. 37, pp. 41, 46]. It is in these terms that Voltaire combats Pascal, and the truth is that all these questions have ceased to interest either Voltaire or his contemporaries. He believes he knows all about man that can be known; he esteems that the time is past for man to resort to introspection: *in sese descendere* as Montaigne put it; and that on the contrary the moment has come for man to look beyond himself. And here we have the explanation of that universal curiosity to which his *Charles XII.*, 1732, his *Zaïre*, 1732, his *Lettres anglaises*, 1734, and a little later his *Essai sur les mœurs*, bear convincing witness. His contemporaries, with the single exception of Vauvenargues, are of his opinion. They too believe that they have a sufficient knowledge of man, of his inner promptings, of

his having treated seriously,—and turned to account for tragedies dealing with middle-class life,—the very same incidents of ordinary existence which Dancourt, Destouches, and Marivaux had made the subject matter of their plays.—How this idea takes clearer shape in the *Préjugé à la mode*, 1735;—in the *École des amis*, 1737;—and in *Mélanide*, 1741.—La Chaussée's aim is to provoke the same kind of emotion as is aroused by tragedy;—without having recourse to an historical background;—to princely personages;—or to too violent passions.—That this conception brings comedy into line with the novel;—and that in point of fact La Chaussée's comedies are merely novels;—though at the same time they pave the way for the plays of Diderot and Beaumarchais.—That, given the character of La Chaussée's dramas, it was a singular idea on his part to write them in verse;—and, bearing in mind the nature of the subjects he treated [Cf. Lanson, *loc. cit.*, pp. 170, 175],—and the success they were to meet with a little later,—the oblivion into which his plays have fallen is perhaps explained by the fact that they are in verse.—It is difficult enough to write comedy in verse;—but to write middle-class drama in verse is impossible.

3. THE WORKS.—*La Fausse antipathie*, 1733;—the *Préjugé à la mode*, 1735;—the *École des Amis*, 1737;—*Mélanide*, 1741;—*Amour*

the secret motives of his actions, of his passions, of his instincts ; and, like Voltaire, they are solely concerned with depicting manners. Whether, like Gresset, whose *Méchant* dates from 1747, they write for the stage, or pride themselves on being philosophers as was the case with Duclos, whose *Considérations sur les mœurs* will appear in 1750, their observation is not only restricted to man considered as a member of society, but it does not attempt to deal with the fundamental qualities of man, held to be always and in every respect identical. Voltaire expressly states that such is his belief : " Nature, he says, is everywhere the same." He is never weary of repeating the assertion of Harlequin: "*Tutto il mondo é fatto come la nostra famiglia.*" His object in studying history is to discover proofs of this saying ; and he even styles his method " the philosophic view of history." Any differences on

pour amour, 1742 ;—*Paméla*, 1743 ;—the *École des mères*, 1744 ;—the *Rival de lui-même*, 1746 ;—the *Gouvernante*, 1747 ;—the *Ecole de la jeunesse*, 1749 ;—the *Homme de fortune*, 1751 ;—the *Retour imprévu*, 1756.

La Chaussée is also the author of a number of somewhat coarse *Contes* in verse ;—of an *Epître* in defence of the Ancients, which, published in 1731 under the title *Epître de Clio*, was the beginning of his literary reputation ;—and of a wretchedly bad tragedy, *Maximien*, 1738.

The only complete edition of La Chaussée's works is that published in Paris by Prault, 1761–1762.

V.—The first period of Voltaire's life [1694–1750].

1. THE SOURCES.—The complete works of Voltaire himself (Beuchot's edition) ;—and the eighteen volumes of his correspondence (Moland's edition, Paris 1878–1882) ;—Condorcet, *Vie de Voltaire*, 1787 ;—G. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et la société française au XVIII^e siècle*, 2nd edition, 8 vols., Paris, 1871–1876 ;—and G. Bengesco, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Voltaire*, 4 vols., Paris, 1882–1890.

The two last mentioned works summarise or refer the student to the majority of the other books dealing with Voltaire.

which he may happen, in passing from one epoch to another, he ascribes to the slow "progress of enlightenment." His historical studies may not give him a very lofty idea of human nature, but he nevertheless continues of opinion that "we are a species of monkey that can be taught to act either reasonably or unreasonably": and to afford us such teaching is precisely the end he has in view. And in this way the conception is arrived at of an universal man, an extremely tractable and pliable being, a man who remains everywhere the same, who, properly speaking, is neither a Frenchman nor an Englishman, but "man," and the diversity of whose manners is only interesting so far as there seems a possibility of replacing it by uniformity.

The same idea underlies the *Esprit des Lois* (1748) of Montesquieu, unless indeed some other idea be discoverable of a nature to elucidate the obscurities and to recon-

However, we add the following works from which foreign opinion on the subject of Voltaire may be learned: John Morley, *Voltaire*, London, 1874;—J. F. Strauss's six lectures on Voltaire;—James Parton, *Life of Voltaire*, London, 1881;—and W. Kreiten, S.J., *Voltaire, ein Characterbild*, 2nd edition, Fribourg (Brisgau), 1885.

2. VOLTAIRE'S EARLIER YEARS.—His family and his middle-class extraction [Cf. above the articles MOLIÈRE, BOILEAU, REGNARD];—his education at the College of Clermont;—his early masters [Fathers Porée, Tournemine, Thoulié (d'Olivet)];—his early friends [d'Argenson, Cideville, Maisons, d'Argental];—and his entry into society, 1711.—The society gathered round the Vendôme family;—and that it was a school of gallantry, vulgar debauchery, and infidelity.—The Holland incident, and Arouet's first love affairs [Cf. *Correspondance* between 1713 and 1714, and Mme Dunoyer's *Lettres historiques et galantes*].—His first satirical writings.—First exile at Tulle, and then at Sully-sur-Loire, 1716.—His return to Paris; —two new satires are ascribed to him;—and he is imprisoned in the Bastille for the first time [May, 1717—to April, 1718].—The first performance of *Œdipe* [November, 1718] and the first important success of Arouet;—who on this occasion takes the name of Voltaire.—Of the importance at this period of a success scored on the stage;—and of the acquaintances Voltaire makes,

cile the contradictions of this celebrated book. For to deny that the book is obscure is impossible: the different interpretations that have been given are proof of its obscurity. Was Montesquieu's sole intention in the *Esprit des Lois* to give a further version of or a sequel to his *Lettres persanes*; and can it be that this great work, which occupied twenty years of his life is mainly a political pamphlet, in which it sometimes happens that the author points out what he considers to be the proper remedies for the evils he denounces? Voltaire rather inclines to this opinion, and he had it in view when he blamed Montesquieu "for having played the witling in a book of universal jurisprudence." The opinion is also that of the last editor of the *Esprit des Lois*. Or, on the other hand, did Montesquieu propose, as the author of the *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture sainte* had done before him, to give a sketch of

thanks to his *Œdipe*;—acquaintances that improve his social standing [the Villars and Richelieu families, the Duchesse de Maine];—useful acquaintances [the banker Hogguers and the brothers Paris].—Voltaire's business instinct is awakened;—his intrigues with a view to embarking on a diplomatic career through the agency of Dubois;—and his taste for secret missions.—Voltaire's second journey to Holland.—The *Epître à Uranie*, 1722;—and why it is important to bear in mind the date of this work.—The first publication of the *Henriade*, 1723;—*Marianne*, 1724.—Voltaire installs himself in the good graces of the Marquise de Prie.—The Chevalier de Rohan incident [December, 1725];—second imprisonment in the Bastille [April, 1726];—and his exile in England [May 2, 1726].

Voltaire's first impressions in England [Cf. Beuchot, vol. xxxvii.];—and, in this connection, a few words as to the French colony in London in 1726 [Cf. Prévost, *Histoire de M. de Montcal*, and J. Churton Collins, *Bolingbroke . . . and Voltaire in England*, London, 1886].—Voltaire renews his acquaintance with Bolingbroke, and makes the acquaintance of Pope, of "the merchant" Falkener, etc.—He learns English and studies Newton, Locke, and Bacon;—he sees Congreve's comedies performed,—and Shakespeare's dramas.—He writes his *Essai sur la Poésie épique*.—The English freethinkers [Cf. Tabaraud, what he considered the best form of government, and did he discover it, according to his own expression, "in the woods," as his predecessor, Bossuet, had lighted on it in the Bible? This latter view is held by certain of his commentators, by d'Alembert for instance; and since d'Alembert by Tracy; and since Tracy by several others. It has also been suggested that his intention may have been to systematise historical data according to the method in use in natural science, or in other words to apply the "positive method," at a period at which it had not yet been invented, to a subject which even at the present day admits of its utilisation to a less degree than any other. This was the view adopted by Auguste Comte, and Taine also adhered to it in his *Ancien régime*. The truth is, however, that none of these interpretations mutually exclude one another. If the *Esprit des Lois* is wanting in clearness,

Histoire du Philosophisme anglais, Paris, 1806; and Leslie Stephen, *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 2nd edition, 1881];—and that, while taking into account their influence on Voltaire, it must be remembered how much they owe to Bayle.—Of the advantage Voltaire derived from his stay in England [Cf. John Morley, *Voltaire*];—and that it has perhaps been a little exaggerated.

The *Histoire de Charles XII.*, 1731, and the *Lettres philosophiques.*—How did the idea of writing the history of Charles XII. occur to Voltaire?—and that it probably dates from the time of his acquaintance with the Baron de Görtz.—Character of the work;—and that while conceiving it as a tragedy,—Voltaire spared no pains to make it a serious, historical work [Cf. Bengesco, *Bibliographie*, vol. i., p. 373 and fol.]. Of the use that is made in *Charles XII.* of information obtained orally;—and that the value of the book is due in part to this information.—*Charles XII.* regarded as an early attempt to write history in a philosophic spirit [Cf. the *Essai sur les guerres civiles* and the notes to the *Henriade*],—and, in this connection, of Voltaire's curious mixture of admiration for his hero and of indignation against him.—*Zaïre*, 1732.—The publication of the *Lettres philosophiques*, 1734.—Significance of the book, and how much more considerable it is than that of the *Lettres persanes*,—and particularly so if it be if it makes greater claims upon the perspicacity of the reader than the *Essai sur les mœurs*, if we can only regard it as the rough draught of a great book, the reason is that it is a confused medley of three or four things, of the connection between which Montesquieu himself had no exact intuition. "If it be desired to inquire into the design of the author, he wrote,—in a Preface which is a monument of literary vanity,—it can properly be discovered only in the plan of the work"; a statement which is an indirect way of confessing or rather of dissembling the truth that in reality and at bottom he had no design or plan. In short, let us have the courage to admit that the *Esprit des Lois* is a failure, and that it will always be impossible to establish the unity of its plan for the excellent reason that Montesquieu himself in writing it was never very sure of his own purpose.

taken together with the *Remarques sur les Pensées de Pascal*,—which belong to the same date.—The subjects dealt with in the *Lettres*.—Religion and tolerance [*Lettres*, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7].—Government, politics and commerce [8, 9, 10].—Science and philosophy [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17].—English literature and the social standing of men of letters [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24].—Of certain ideas Voltaire and Montesquieu possess in common:—on the supreme importance of the social institution;—on the dangers of religion,

—*Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!*

on the lay constitution of the society of the future;—and on the force of opinion.—Condemnation of the *Lettres philosophiques* [June, 1734].

Voltaire's sojourn at Cirey.—His liaison with Mme du Châtelet;—he takes up his residence at Cirey [Cf. Eugène Asse's editions of the *Lettres de Mme de Graffigny*, Paris, 1879; and of the *Lettres de Mme du Châtelet*, Paris, 1882].—Varied nature of Voltaire's writings:—his *Alzire*, 1736;—*Le Mondain*, 1736;—and of the clearness with which the idea of progress is expressed in this work.—The comedy *L'enfant prodigue*, 1736;—Voltaire enters into correspondence with the Prince Royal of Prussia, afterwards Frederick II.;—the *Essai sur*

It remains to explain why the book had such a brilliant, such a notable success in its time throughout Europe as well as in France, and to determine what it is that we ourselves still like or admire in it. Montesquieu's contemporaries were charmed by the wit or sedate humour of the work, by its epigrammatic tone and phraseology, by the chapter on Despotism or the chapter on Slavery; by its allusions, quotations and singularities; by the fashion, at once discreet and licentious, in which it treats of the curious or indecent customs of Benin, of Calicut and of Borneo; by its anecdotes; by the novelty of the information it contained; by its praise of "honour" and "virtue." Montesquieu was the first to enable ladies to imagine, as they proceeded with their toilette, that they understood legal language, and it was due to him that "universal jurisprudence" became a topic of conversation

la nature du feu, 1737 [Cf. Émile Saigey, *La Physique de Voltaire*, Paris, 1873];—the *Discours sur l'homme*, 1738;—the *Eléments de la philosophie de Newton*, 1738;—the quarrel with Desfontaines, 1738–1740 [Cf. Maynard, *Voltaire, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1867, vol. i.; and Nisard, *Les ennemis de Voltaire*, Paris, 1853];—*Zulime*, 1740;—*Doutes sur la mesure des forces motrices*, 1741;—*Mahomet*, 1742;—*Mérope*, 1743.

Voltaire's plays [Cf. Geoffroy, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, vol. iii.; Emile Deschanel, *Le théâtre de Voltaire*, Paris, 1886; and H. Lion, *Les Tragédies de Voltaire*, Paris, 1896].—Voltaire's passion for the theatre;—and the reality, flexibility, and variety of his dramatic aptitudes.—Successive influence of Racine, the elder Crébillon, and Shakespeare on Voltaire's conception of the drama.—*Zaïre*, 1732;—and whether Voltaire had *Bajazet* or Shakespeare's *Othello* most in mind in writing it?—The *Mort de César*, 1735;—and the idea of tragedy from which love should be absent.—Of certain innovations introduced to the French stage by Voltaire.—Subjects of pure invention.—Extension of the localities in which the scene is laid and the development of local colour:—*Zaïre* and the Mussulman world.—*Alzire* and America;—the *Orphelin de la Chine* and the Asiatic world.—National reminiscences;—and, in this connection, in the *salons* and at court—where he was not without friends. As Fontenelle had done before him, he annexed to the domain of literature a new and spacious province. For this service we are still grateful to him, if it be the sign of a great writer to utilise for literary purposes a subject hitherto foreign to literature, to bring it at once within general reach, and by the sole authority of his work and name to ensure its remaining common property for the future. But in the eyes of the men of his time, profoundly convinced as they were of the "charm of living," his chief claim upon their gratitude was the ardent, the almost religious respect he professed for the "social institution," whose intangibility he seemed to have based on deep-lying grounds that raised it even above the laws. And finally his contemporaries were thankful to him for the perspective of increasing perfection he opened up

of the influence of the *Henriade* on the tragedy of the eighteenth century.—The abuse in Voltaire's tragedies of such romantic expedients as misunderstandings and recognitions [Cf. in this respect Crébillon's plays].—Voltaire's pathos;—and does it merit the praise that has been bestowed on it [Cf. Vinet, *Littérature française au XVII^e siècle*]?—How Voltaire compromised his qualifications as a dramatist;—by converting tragedy into a vehicle for the propagation of philosophic theories;—by choosing his subjects in accordance with the exigences of the taste of his time rather than in accordance with any conception of art;—and by the fact that he grew more and more unable to dissociate himself from his personages.—That for all these reasons it is unnecessary to study those of Voltaire's plays that are posterior to *Sémiramis*, 1748;—since from this date onwards,—with the possible exception of *Tancrède*,—he will produce nothing in the way of tragedy,—and still less in the way of comedy,—that is not far inferior to his earlier efforts.—A few words as to the mediocrity of Voltaire's comedies.

Voltaire at Court.—His relations with Mme de Châteauroux;—and more particularly with Mme de Pompadour.—He flatters himself that the king will be prevailed on by his new mistress to espouse the cause of the philosophers;—and he overwhelms the sovereign with before them. At the present day we may not be able to admit that this fervent faith in the destinies of humanity lends the *Esprit des Lois* the unity in which it is deficient, but we can at least allow that it gives the book its elevation.

"Every man—he had written in his *Lettres persanes*—is capable of contributing to the good of a fellow man, but to assure the welfare of an entire society is to resemble the Gods!" Montesquieu, like the Stoics of whom he was so great an admirer, desired to resemble the Gods, and as a means to this end he subordinated, as did the Stoics, every consideration to the good of society. In the view of the author of the *Esprit des Lois* we are men merely so far as we are fitted for society. In his eyes the social utility of a law is the criterion, not only of its character and merit, but also of its moral

---

flatteries;—which bring him the title of historiographer of France [1745].—The *Poème de Fontenoy*, 1745; and the *Temple de la Gloire*, 1745.—Voltaire elected to and received at the French Academy [May, 1746].—He is appointed gentleman in waiting to the king [December, 1746].—Voltaire's imprudences.—He wearies the king by his excessive flatteries;—Mme de Pompadour by his familiarity;—and the courtiers by his self-sufficiency.

He retires to the residence of the Duchesse de Maine at Sceaux, 1747.—His early tales: *Le Monde comme il va*, *Cosi Sancta*, *Zadig*, *Micromégas*, 1747;—the quarrels with the Duchesse de Maine.—He leaves Sceaux for Cirey;—his stay at the Court of Lorraine.—Mme du Châtelet's treachery;—and, in this connection, a few words on the subject of the Court of Lorraine, King Stanislas, and the Marquis de St. Lambert;—death of Mme du Châtelet, 1749;—and return of Voltaire to Paris.—Difficulties of his situation;—owing to his being regarded with equal suspicion by the court and the new generation of "men of letters."—His dramatic rivalry with the elder Crébillon.—His *Oreste*, 1750, and his *Rome sauvée*, 1752.—Frederick proposes to him that he shall take up his residence in Berlin.—Voltaire's hesitations [Cf. Marmontel in his Memoirs].—Frederick's advances to Baculard d'Arnaud cause him to make up his mind.—His excellence or hatefulness and even of its intrinsic justice. Indeed he has allowed the observation to fall from his pen, that from the reprehensible principle of the denial of the immortality of the soul "the Stoics deduced consequences which, *although not accurate*, were admirable from a social point of view" [Cf. *Esprit des Lois*, xxiv., chap. 19]. In another passage he writes [Cf. *Esprit des Lois*, xxiv., chap. 1]: "Just as in the dark it is possible to distinguish different degrees of obscurity . . . so we may compare false religions with a view to deciding which of them are most in conformity with the good of society." And if we probe his opinions to the bottom, what do we find is his grievance—vented, be it said, with infinite precaution—against the "true religion"? It is that certain of its laws may clash with the good of society. "What hold has the law on a man who firmly believes that the

departure for Berlin [June 18, 1750];—and his arrival at Potsdam [July 10, 1750].—Sincerity of his enthusiasm for Frederick;—and, in this connection, of the benefits Voltaire derived from his sojourn in Prussia.—When he left Paris he was in evil odour,—and was only regarded there as one man of letters among many;—his stay in Berlin,—and his intimacy with Frederick,—in spite of the Frankfort incident,—will make of him in less than three years,—a man whose situation is henceforth unique,—the trusted literary adviser of the Powers;—and already almost the king of European literature.

VI.—**Jean-Baptiste Gresset** [Amiens, 1709; † 1777, Amiens].

1. The Sources.—D'Alembert, *Réponse au discours de réception de l'abbé Millot*, 1777;—Father Daire, *Vie de Gresset*, Paris, 1779;—Maximilien Robespierre, *Éloge de Gresset*, Paris, 1785;—Notice preceding Renouard's edition, Paris, 1811;—Campenon, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Gresset*, Paris, 1823;—E. Wogue, *Gresset*, Paris, 1894.

2. The Poet;—and that his sole merit is that he is representative of a very special phase in the art of writing in verse;—the publication of *Ver-Vert* in 1734 having been almost a literary event;—and the *Méchant* (1747) being certainly the best comedy in verse we have of

severest penalty the magistrates are able to inflict on him will end in a moment in ushering him into a state of bliss?" [Cf. *Esprit de Lois*, xxiv., chap. 14]. We touch here on the central idea of his book, and this is the standpoint we must take up if we desire "to discover the purport" of his work. However confused the composition of the book may seem, and strange as may be the medley of laws that form its subject matter, we have only to consider these various laws from the point of view of their bearing on the "good of society," and at once the reasons of the author's mode of proceeding become apparent and a fresh light is thrown on his book. In this way Montesquieu has his revenge. What was obscure in his work grows less obscure, what was disconnected acquires cohesion, and what seemed contradictory ceases to be so. The *Esprit des Lois* remains

the eighteenth century;—without excepting even Alexis Piron's *Métromanie*.—The work, moreover, is not without a certain satirical force;—and some "documentary" value;—admitting the principal personage in the *Méchant* to be a transitional type between the dandies of Marivaux [Cf. *L'Epreuve*] and the heroes of the *Liaisons dangereuses*.—Gresset's recantation, 1759;—and Voltaire's lines:

> Gresset is mistaken, he is not so guilty . . .

Have we lost much by the auto-da-fé Gresset made of his manuscripts?—and that his unpublished pieces, the *Ouvroir* or the *Gazetin*, doubtless contained nothing that is not to be found in his *Ver-Vert*.

3. THE WORKS.—Gresset's works comprise:

(1) His poems, including *Ver-Vert*, the *Carême impromptu*, the *Lutrin vivant*, the *Chartreuse*, and some Epistles and Odes;—also a somewhat feeble translation in verse of Virgil's Eclogues.

(2) His plays, comprising *Edouard III.*, a tragedy; *Sidney*, a drama in verse; and the *Méchant*, a comedy.

(3) Some prose writings, of which the most noteworthy is perhaps his *Discours de réception*, 1748. A posthumous poem of Gresset's in irregular verse, *Le Parrain magnifique*, was published in 1810.

for all this an imperfect book, but it is felt to be less unworthy of its lofty fortune; it becomes comprehensible that its influence should have surpassed its merit, a circumstance explained by the consideration that the genius of Montesquieu was doubtless superior to his work.

At the same time this central idea of the *Esprit des Lois* was not the exclusive property of Montesquieu; on the contrary it is met with in the writings of almost all his contemporaries. A "social" literature was bound to lead up to it, and thus to gain at first in comprehensiveness what it was losing in depth, and to perish or at least be distorted and disorganised by the carrying to extremes of its principle? At the very moment when Montesquieu was completing the *Esprit des Lois*, Vauvenargues was issuing his *Introduction à la connaissance de l'esprit humain* (1746), where the following

The best edition of his works is Renouard's edition, 2 volumes, Paris, 1811.

VII.—**Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues** [Aix in Provence, 1715; † 1747, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Suard's notice; and Saint-Maurice's *Éloge de Vauvenargues* to be found at the beginning of vols. i. and iii. of the edition of 1821;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. iii., 1850;—A. Vinet, *Littérature française au XVIIIᵉ siècle*;—Prévost-Paradol, *Moralistes français*;—Gilbert, *Éloge de Vauvenargues*, preceding his edition, Paris, 1857;—Maurice Paléologue, *Vauvenargues* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1890.

2. THE MORALIST.—His melancholy destiny.—He is a transitional type.—The essential and original characteristic of Vauvenargues consists in his having combined some of the traits of Pascal's pessimism with J. J. Rousseau's optimism;—while his work, though uncompleted, is the confession of a soul.

Vauvenargues' military career and campaigns;—his love of glory; his generosity of heart;—and his love of humanity.—Comparison in this respect between Vauvenargues and La Rochefoucauld.—Did Vauvenargues possess a doctrine?—and that in any case his prepassage is to be read: "For anything to be regarded as good by the whole of society, it is necessary that it should tend to the advantage of the whole of society, and for it to be regarded as an evil, it must tend to the destruction of society: *herein lies the main characteristic of what is morally good or morally evil.*" He was briefly discussing, not the "spirit," but the "origin" of laws; and he added: "We are born and we grow up in the shade of these solemn conventions; we owe them the security of our life and the tranquillity that attends it. The laws are also our only title to our possessions: from the very dawn of our life we profit by their beneficent consequences, and we are attached to them by bonds that grow ever stronger and stronger. Whoever claims to throw off this authority to which he owes everything, cannot esteem it unjust that it should deprive him of everything—even of his life.

mature death prevented him from reconciling its contradictions,—and from developing all its consequences.—His veneration for social institutions [*Introduction à la connaissance*, &c., chap. 43].—His indulgent attitude towards the passions and the apology he makes for them [Cf. *Introd.* bk. ii., chap. 42, and *Réflexions et Maximes*, Ed. Gilbert, 122, 123, 124, 149, 151, 153, 154].—His belief in the goodness of nature;—and his theory as to the superiority of sentiment over reason [Cf. *Réflexions et Maximes*, *passim*, and *Réflexions sur divers sujets*, 54].—Analogy between these ideas and those to which Rousseau will soon give expression;—and to what is this analogy to be attributed?—to the resemblance between the two periods?—or to the fact that Vauvenargues, like Rousseau, was self taught?

How superior his moral personality is to that of Rousseau;—though his talent is inferior.—Vauvenargues' eloquence.—Melancholy tone of some of his thoughts.—Delicacy of his literary taste.

3. THE WORKS.—Vauvenargues' works consist of (1) his *Introduction à la connaissance de l'esprit humain*, which was first published in 1746, and to which were joined the *Réflexions sur divers sujets*; the *Conseils à un jeune homme*, the *Réflexions critiques sur quelques poètes* and some *Caractères* in the manner of La Bruyère;—(2) his

Is it reasonable that an individual should dare to sacrifice his fellows solely in his own interest, and that society should not be able to restore the public peace at the cost of his ruin!" To discuss these daring principles is beyond our province here, but it is not impossible that Montesquieu had some knowledge of them, and in any case their resemblance to those of the *Esprit des Lois* is plain. The truth doubtless is that they pervaded the atmosphere of the time in a disconnected and inchoate state, and that in succession the author of the *Introduction à la connaissance de l'esprit humain*, the author of the *Esprit des Lois* and the author of the *Essai sur les mœurs* did no more than give them literary expression, while adapting them respectively the first to his subject, the second to his vague "plan," and the third to the bent of his intellect.

Dialogues;—(3) his correspondence with Voltaire, Fauries de Saint-Vincent and the Marquis de Mirabeau.

Vauvenargues was prevented by his early death from completing any of his writings with the exception of his *Introduction*. The remainder of his works have been enriched by the successive addition of unpublished fragments, which have nearly doubled their volume.

For example, Suard published for the first time in 1806 the *Traité sur le libre arbitre*;—eighteen of his dialogues did not see the light till 1821;—while his correspondence with Mirabeau is only to be found in the last edition of his works that has been published, that edited by Gilbert, in 2 volumes 8vo, Paris, 1857, Furne.

VIII.—**Charles Pinot Duclos** [Dinan, 1704; † 1772, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Duclos' Memoirs (unfinished);—Mme d'Epinay, *Mémoires*;—Noual de la Houssaye (Duclos' nephew), *Éloge de Duclos*, 1806;—Villenave, Notice preceding his edition of the works, 1821;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix., 1853;—Lucien Perey and G. Maugras, *La Jeunesse de Mme d'Epinay*, Paris, 1882;—L. Brunel, *Les philosophes et l'Académie française au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1884.

2. The Writer.—His licentious youth,—and his habit of adopting

Another idea takes definite shape at about the same period: the idea of progress which, first evolved, as we saw, some fifty years before in the course of the quarrel between the ancients and moderns, has since been profiting, as it were, by the losses sustained by the spirit of tradition and now penetrates into the very sanctuary of routine, into the Sorbonne itself. Are we to believe that because Voltaire and Montesquieu did not expressly give this idea the name by which we know it, they on that account had no "presentiment of the important part it was about to play on the world's stage"? This view can only be taken by those who have read these writers most inattentively, for they are full of the idea of progress. Shall we suppose that Montesquieu was not aware of what he was saying when he wrote that "human laws—as compared with the laws of religion

---

cynical airs.—His eccentric humour;—and the mediocrity of his talent.—His novels: *Histoire de la baronne de Luz*, 1741;—and the *Confessions du comte de . . .* 1742;—and that they are of a kindred stamp to those of the younger Crébillon;—that is as indecent, as tedious, and doubtless as false.—His *Histoire de Louis XI.*, 1745, is almost unreadable at the present day.—On the other hand his *Considérations sur les mœurs de ce siècle*, 1750,—a fairly well written work,— contains somewhat interesting observations on various subjects;—and helps to an understanding of the manners of his time [See in particular the second chapter dealing with "education" and "prejudices";—the fifth with "reputation," "celebrity," "renown," and "consideration";—the seventh with "people who are the fashion";—and the eleventh with "men of letters"]. —The success of this book, too, was considerable;—no literary man has been more the fashion than was Duclos in his time;—while none have better looked after their interests.—He was also successful in preserving his independence;—and his dignity;—not only with respect to persons of position and social standing;—but more especially with respect to his fellow men of letters;—and particularly with respect to the Encyclopedists.—For these reasons his personality has a significance that is not possessed by his works;—and on this account he deserves to be remembered.

—owe their advantage to their novelty" [Cf. *Esprit des Lois*, xxvi., ch. 2], or that Voltaire was blind to what he was about, when he got himself into trouble in connection with his *Mondain?* Moreover we have no hesitation in affirming that the young Bachelor of Letters, who expressed himself in the following terms in a Discourse dated 1750, had read Voltaire and Montesquieu, even if he did not owe them his inspiration: "Societies are seen to come into existence and the foundation is witnessed of nations, which in turn dominate other nations or are subject to them. . . . Interest, ambition, and vainglory perpetually change the aspect of the world and deluge the earth with blood, but amid their ravages, human enlightenment advances, manners grow milder, the nations are brought closer together, commerce and politics at last unite the different parts of the globe, and

---

3. THE WORKS.—They include in addition to his novels, to his *Louis XI.*, and to his *Considérations*:

(1) A certain number of memoirs contributed to the *Recueil de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, the two most important among them relating to the origin of and the changes in the French and Celtic languages;—an annotated edition of the Port-Royal Grammar, 1754. A new system of orthography is followed in the printing of this work;—and the Preface to the 4th edition of the dictionary of the Academy, 1762.

(2) Of his *Mémoires secrets sur les règnes de Louis XIV. et de Louis XV.* This work was first published in 1791, and its interest has greatly diminished since the appearance of the Memoirs of Saint-Simon.

(3) Of his *Considérations sur l'Italie*, [1766–1767] also published for the first time in 1791.

(4) Of his *Essai sur les corvées*, 1759, and of his *Réflexions sur les corvées*, 1762, two works which are certainly by the same author, though it has not been absolutely proved that that author is Duclos.

The most complete edition of Duclos' works is that edited by Villenave, Paris, 1821.

the total mass of the human race, traversing alternate periods of calm and agitation, of prosperity and of suffering, moves on, unceasingly though slowly, towards a state of greater perfection" [Cf. Turgot's Works, Daire's edition, vol. ii.]. Without wishing in any way to rob Turgot of his merit, or of the honour that is paid him, one is justified in pointing out that there is not a word in this quotation or a line in the whole of the Discourse, which does not recall some passage or other of the *Esprit des Lois* or the *Essai sur les mœurs*. That Turgot gives us the very spirit of these works is still clearer, if Voltaire conceived his *Essai sur les mœurs* solely with a view to demonstrating the superiority of his century over all others; and if Montesquieu, for his part, sought to ground his conviction that "history offers nothing comparable with the might of the Europe of his time" on

EIGHTH PERIOD

The Encyclopedia and the Encyclopedists

1750–1765

1. THE SOURCES.—The Memoirs and Letters of the time, and in particular: Voltaire's correspondence;—the Memoirs of d'Argenson; of Barbier; of Morellet; of Marmontel;—Frederick the Great's correspondence [Preuss' edition];—Ravaisson, *Archives de la Bastille*, vol. xii., covering the years 1709–1772;—Barruel, *Histoire du Jacobinisme*, vol. i., London, 1797;—Picot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le XVIII*^e^ *siècle*, Paris, 1806 and the last edition, 1853–1857;—Fréron's *Année littéraire*;—Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire*;—P. Rousseau's [of Toulouse] collection of the *Journal encyclopédique*.

The complete works of d'Alembert, Paris, 1821;—of Diderot, the Assézat and Maurice Tourneux edition, Paris, 1875–1877;—of Voltaire, Beuchot's edition, and more especially the *Mélanges* [vols. 37–50];—of Helvétius, Didot's edition, Paris, 1795;—and of Condorcet, O'Connor's edition, Paris, 1847–1849.

the superiority of the laws of his period? Is it necessary to make the further remark that Turgot's Discourse, written and delivered in Latin by an obscure individual, attracted but the slightest attention? In consequence, are we not in some measure entitled to conclude that while he was perhaps the first to speak of the idea of progress in express terms, it was not until after the conception had been spread abroad by his masters?

In reality it would seem difficult to suppose that the discoveries in the domain of Science alone—to say nothing of the improvements in the mechanical arts or in the conditions of daily life—should not have suggested the idea of progress to the men of whom Turgot was the disciple. With scarcely an exception they were men of science themselves. Montesquieu had begun his career by composing treatises on the functions of the renal

With regard to Diderot in particular consult: his correspondence with Mlle. Volland; his *Paradoxe sur le comédien*; and his *Neveu de Rameau*;—Mme de Vandeul's (his daughter) *Mémoires sur Diderot*, 1787;—Naigeon, *Mémoires historiques et philosophiques sur M. Diderot*, Paris, 1821;—Rosenkranz, *Diderot's Leben und Werke*, Leipsic, 1866;—John Morley, *Diderot and the Encyclopedists*, London, 1878;—Edmond Scherer, *Diderot, étude*, Paris, 1880.

Consult for the second half of Voltaire's life, in addition to the works mentioned above:—his correspondence with Mme du Deffand, Lescure's edition, Paris, 1865;—Lucien Perey and G. Maugras, *La vie intime de Voltaire aux Délices*, Paris, 1885;—G. Maugras, *Voltaire et Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, Paris, 1886.

Consult for d'Alembert: his correspondence with Frederick—the *Correspondance de Mme du Deffand*, Lescure's edition, 1865;—the correspondence of Mlle de Lespinasse, edition Eug. Asse, 1876;—Condorcet, *Éloge d'Alembert*, among his *Éloges académiques*, 1784;—Charles Henry, *Correspondance inédite d'Alembert*, Paris, 1887;—J. Bertrand, *d'Alembert* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1889.

Useful details may be obtained from the following works:—Malesherbe's *Mémoires sur la librairie*, Paris, 1809;—Garat, *Mémoires sur* glands (1718) and on the causes of the weight of bodies, while the first important work he had planned was a physical history of the earth. Voltaire's essays on the nature of fire and on the measurement of motive forces (1741) were held in esteem. On his return from his sojourn in England he had promulgated the theories of Newton. While it might be questioned whether his *Alzire* or his *Zaïre* raised him above Racine or Corneille, there could be no doubt that he possessed a knowledge of many matters with which the author of the *Cid* and the author of *Andromaque* had had no acquaintance and could have had no acquaintance. He was conscious, and those around him were conscious also, that new horizons had opened out before the human intelligence. It was the joint action of all these considerations, and not a theoretical view expressed by a

la vie de M. Suard, Paris, 1820;—Felix Rocquain, *L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution*, Paris, 1878;—J. Küntziger, *La propagande des Encyclopédistes français en Belgique*, Paris, 1891;—Henri Francotte, *La propagande des Encyclopédistes français au pays de Liège*, Brussels, 1880;—Edmond Scherer, *Melchoir Grimm*, Paris, 1887.

Finally, the subject should be studied in the following works from a general point of view: Damiron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie au XVIIIe siècle*, 1858–1864;—Lanfrey, *L'église et les philosophes au XVIIIe siècle*, 1855;—Ernest Bersot, *Études sur la XVIIIe siècle*, 1855;—Barni, *Histoire des idées politiques et morales en France au XVIIIe siècle*, 1865–1866;—and H. Taine, *Ancien Régime*, 1875.

I.—The Early Phases of the Undertaking.

The encyclopedias of the Renaissance—and in particular the *Encyclopedia omnium scientiarum* of Alstedius or Alstedt, 1620;—Bayles' Dictionary [Cf. *supra*], 1696–1706;—and Ephraim Chambers' English Cyclopedia, 1728.—The translation of this latter work is suggested to the bookseller Lebreton;—who agrees to the idea, 1740;—but the translators and the publisher falling out,—the

Bachelor of the Sorbonne, that was contributing to the formation, the development, and the popularity of the idea of progress. The number and variety of the recent acquisitions made by science gave weight to the conception, with the result that science, if not already the idol it was destined to become, was universally regarded with respect or even with superstition, while these preoccupations of a scientific order invested literature with a new character. Buffon, who may almost be said to have learned to read in the mathematical writings of the Marquis de l'Hôpital, began his career in the field of "letters" with translations of Hales' work on vegetable statics and Newton's treatise on fluxions (1740). There were still writers of tragedies, novels, and comedies, but it was with a new System of Musical Notation that Rousseau arrived in Paris

undertaking remains in abeyance until the intervention of the Abbé du Gua de Malves [Cf. as to du Gua de Malves, Diderot's *Salons*; and Condorcet's *Éloge de du Gua de Malves*], who widens the scope of the undertaking;—but he too falls out with Lebreton;—who approaches d'Alembert and Diderot on the subject. The scheme is still further enlarged;—Lebreton secures additional financial support;—d'Alembert and Diderot recruit numerous writers;—and d'Aguessau is prevailed on to grant the "privilege" necessary for the publication of the work, 1746.—Of the "privilege" to publish a book under the old *régime* and of its true nature [Cf. Saugrain, *Le code de la librairie*, 1744; Diderot, *Lettre sur le commerce de la librairie*, 1767; and Malesherbes, *Mémoires sur la librairie*, 1809]. That the authorities in nowise looked askance at the publication of the Encyclopedia;—and how Diderot having been incarcerated at Vincennes,—it was due to the efforts of the booksellers that he was set at liberty,—so as to allow him to work at the Encyclopedia, 1749.—The Prospectus of the Encyclopedia;—it sets forth that the object of the work was twofold: (1) to systematise the branches of human knowledge;—(2) to give the "mechanical arts" the place they deserved in this schema.—This dual purpose is again insisted on in the Preliminary Discourse to the Encyclopedia.—Other novelties an-

(1741) from Geneva or Lyons, and it was his Thoughts on the Interpretation of Nature that first raised Diderot from obscurity. This new trend of literature was to become more clearly defined every day, and in 1750 was to find its ultimate expression in the Encyclopedia.

What share in this movement is to be ascribed to English influence? It is difficult to answer the question with exactness [Cf. on this subject: Tabaraud, *Histoire du philosophisme anglais*, and Leslie Stephen, *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*]. The influence is beyond doubt, and if it merely be desired to fix the date at which it began to operate, it is not of much importance whether choice be made of the year 1725, the year of publication of Béat de Muralt's *Lettres sur les Anglais*, or of the year 1733, in which the Abbé Prévost founded his newspaper, or of the year 1734, the year of publica-

nounced in the Discourse, and that they are of more far-reaching significance than would be thought at first sight;—while they may be traced to the influence of Descartes as well as to that of Bacon.—But to arrive at the true significance of the Discourse it must be read in connection with the article on Encyclopedias in the Encyclopedia itself.—D'Alembert is the author of the Discourse, and Diderot that of the article.

II.—**Jean Le Rond d'Alembert** [Paris, 1717; † 1783, Paris].

His parents [he was the son of Mme de Tencin, and, it is said, of the Commissary Destouches];—his studies at the Mazarin college;—his talent for geometry;—his early treatises on the laws of refraction (1739) and on the integral calculus (1740).—He is elected a member of the Académie des Sciences, 1741.—His *Traité de dynamique*, 1743, and his *Mémoire sur la cause générale des vents*, 1746 [Cf. as to the value of d'Alembert's scientific labours, J. Bertrand's *d'Alembert*]. What were the reasons which induced the bookseller Lebreton to give him the editorship of the Encyclopedia,—and, in this connection, of the situation of an Academician under the old *régime*.—Whereas the title of Academician is to-day only an honorary distinction, to be an Acadetion of Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques.* It is known, too, that Voltaire visited England in 1726, Montesquieu in 1729, and Prévost towards the same period. The mere enumeration of the translations from the English about this time would demand several pages, and it can be affirmed without exaggeration that between 1725 and 1750 French versions were given of the entire writings of Pope, Addison, Swift, and Richardson, not to mention minor authors [Cf. Joseph Texte, *Jean Jacques Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire,* Paris, 1895]. If we do not include Locke and Bacon in the list, the reason is that Bacon wrote more especially in Latin, and that in consequence, in 1750, the *Novum organum*, the *De augmentis scientiarum*, and the *Instauratio magna* had already been within the reach of merely cultured readers for a hundred and fifty years;

mician in d'Alembert's time was almost to occupy a State function;—and in particular the Academician possessed influence,—and in virtue of his membership he entered the ranks of "privileged persons."—Other considerations which induced Lebreton to fix his choice on d'Alembert;—his conciliatory disposition;—his social position;—his liaisons with Mme du Deffand,—which should date from 1746 or 1747 [Cf. Lescure's edition of Mme du Deffand's correspondence, Paris, 1865];—his relations with Mme Geoffrin.—He was already almost a personage when he consented to take the Encyclopedia in hand;—and it was in 1752 that Frederick offered to make him President of his Academy of Sciences when the post should become vacant by the death of Maupertuis.

III.—**Denis Diderot** [Langres, 1713; † 1784, Paris].

Diderot's family;—his early studies at Langres and Paris;—his refusal to become a doctor, a barrister, or a solicitor;—he quarrels with his family.—His early poverty;—he writes for the booksellers and gives lessons in mathematics;—he even thinks of turning actor.—His escapades [Cf. Mme de Vandeul, *Mémoires*, and Naigeon, *loc. cit.*].—His marriage, 1743;—and his definite estrangement from his father.—His first translations; Stanyan's History of Greece, 1743;—

while Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding had been accessible to the French public for a shorter period indeed, but still for half a century, through Coste's translation published in 1700.

This observation has its importance, as it helps us to understand the nature of the English influence. For since it is Locke and Bacon who are about to become the intellectual masters of the new generation, the fact that they did not occupy this position earlier doubtless points to the conclusion that the English influence did not come into effect by means of what may be termed infiltration, as the Spanish influence had done formerly, but in consequence of the substitution of a new ideal for that previously in vogue. In other words, so long as the French genius was dominated by the classic deal, and as French literature, as has been seen, re-

---

James' Dictionary of Medicine, 1746;—his *Essai sur le mérite et la vertu*, which is a paraphrase of Shaftesbury.—His first original work, *Les pensées philosophiques*, 1746;—and whether it is true that he wrote it to satisfy a caprice of Mme de Puisieux, his mistress?—In any case she gave him a still more unhappy inspiration when she prompted him to write his *Bijoux indiscrets*, 1748;—an obscene novel in the style of those of Duclos and Crébillon, though infinitely coarser; —and a book of which he will say at a later period "that he would willingly have cut off an arm not to have written it.—His *Lettre sur les aveugles à l'usage de ceux qui voient*, 1749;—and of the interest of a comparison between this work and Condillac's *Traité des sensations*. —The work, moreover, procures Diderot a term of imprisonment at Vincennes;—not on account of its audacity;—but of a passage in it which aroused the displeasure of Mme Dupré de Saint-Maur,—the intimate friend of Réaumur, of the Académie des Sciences.—Of the difference between the situations of Diderot and d'Alembert;—and that it perhaps accounts to some extent for the subsequent straining of their relations.—Diderot has been faithfully portrayed by Bacon in the following sentence: *Sunt qui cogitationum vertigine delectantur, ac pro servitute habent fide fixa aut axiomatis constantibus constringi.*

mained "national" despite its "social" characteristics, so long as this was the case, we did not come under the English influence; but when the classic ideal began to lose ground, the English influence at once entered the breach, *qua data porta,* and asserted its supremacy. These considerations enable us to obtain a better view of the effects of this influence, and to affirm that, to begin with, they were not particularly happy.

"We have borrowed from the English annuities, reversible funds, sinking funds, the construction and manœuvring of ships, the laws of gravitation, the differential calculus, the seven primary colours, and vaccination. Imperceptibly we shall acquire from them their *noble freedom of thought* and their *profound contempt for the petty trifling of the schools.*" It is in these terms that Voltaire wrote to Helvétius, but he forgot to

IV.—The First Difficulties Encountered by the Encyclopedia.

Whether the Jesuits who were bringing out the *Journal de Trévoux* were jealous of the success of the Encyclopedia? [Cf. Diderot, *Lettre au père Berthier*, vol. xiii. of his works; Voltaire, *Le Tombeau de la Sorbonne*, vol. xxxix.; and d'Alembert, *Sur la destruction des Jésuites*].—The thesis of the Abbé de Prades, who was writing articles on theological subjects for the Encyclopedia;—its condemnation by the Sorbonne [Cf. Picot, *op. cit.*, vol. iii., p. 185].—Jesuits, Jansenists, and the official world seize this opportunity to attack the Encyclopedia.—The Abbé de Prades, exiled from Paris, goes to Berlin;—Voltaire seeks to interest Frederick in him;—and it is on this occasion that his relations with d'Alembert and Diderot become for the first time in any way close.—The Encyclopedia is "suppressed" by a decree in Council, 1752 [Cf. *Mémoires de Barbier*, vol. v.; and *Mémoires d'Argenson*, vol. vii.].—But as the work has its protectors at court,—including Mme de Pompadour, who is interested in the undertaking by her doctor, Quesnay;—and in the Cabinet, including M. de Malesherbes himself [Cf. Mme de Vandeul, *Mémoires sur Diderot*], its publication is allowed to go on;—and add that for his part he had borrowed further his *Micromégas* from Swift, his *Poème de la loi naturelle* from Pope, and *Zaïre* from Shakespeare. Moreover, having pillaged Shakespeare himself, he would doubtless have been better advised had he refrained from deterring his contemporaries from the study of one of the deepest and purest sources of poetry the world possesses. Again, if we examine what he terms the "noble freedom of thought" of the English, we find that he refers to the aggressive infidelity of such writers as Bolingbroke, Collins, and Toland. As for the "contempt for the petty trifling of the schools," it is doubtless in these terms that he alludes to the narrow utilitarianism of Locke: "There is no knowledge worthy the name but *that which leads to some new and useful invention*, which teaches us to do something better, quicker, or more easily than

vols. iii., iv., v., vi. and vii. are issued regularly between 1753 and 1757.—The Encyclopedists profit by the conflicts between the Parliament and the court, 1756 [Cf. Rocquain, *L'Esprit révolutionnaire*, etc.];—their imprudences [Cf. the article, *Encyclopédie*];—and their admissions.—Barrister Moreau's pamphlet: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Cacouacs*, 1757,—and the article in the Encyclopedia on Geneva.—Outcry raised by the Geneva pastors, indignant at having been praised for their Socinian tendencies.—Intervention in the quarrel of Voltaire and Rousseau;—Rousseau writes his *Lettre sur les spectacles*, 1758.—D'Alembert's discouragement.—Diderot publishes his *Père de famille*, and Helvétius his *De l'Esprit*, 1758.—The archbishop of Paris issues his pastoral charge.—The Parliament takes cognisance of the affair;—it is decided to judge the Encyclopedia and the book of Helvétius together.—Speech of the Procuror-General;—condemnation of the Encyclopedia;—the "privilege" of which is definitely revoked, March, 1759.—Pitiable retractation of Helvétius;—d'Alembert retires from the scene;—and Rousseau abandons the cause.

V.—**The Second Period of Voltaire's Life,** 1750–1762.

Voltaire's sojourn in Berlin, 1750–1753;—and whether he found before" [Cf. Joseph Texte, *loc. cit.*, p. 100]. Is not the conclusion enforced, that the only English thought which exerted an influence on Frenchmen between 1730 and 1750, was that which offered the least analogy with the classic ideal, which was most contrary and even most hostile to that ideal? The purpose of literature, which from being "psychological and moral" had been first "social," and then "scientific," was now to become purely practical under the influence of Bacon and Locke. Backed by the authority of Newton, who somewhere speaks of poetry as ingenious fiddle-faddle, geometricians are about to ask what a tragedy "proves"; while d'Alembert will not hesitate to declare in the preliminary notice to the Encyclopedia "that if the ancients had produced an encyclopedia, as they produced so many great works, and had this manuscript alone survived the burning of the famous

---

Frederick a more indulgent master than Louis XV.?—The mistakes he made;—he insists on the king dismissing Baculard d'Arnaud;—and on his not taking Fréron as correspondent.—The incident in connection with the Jew Herschel [Cf. Desnoiresterres, vol. iv.; and Strauss, *Voltaire*].—Voltaire's license of language and attitude towards Frederick.—His quarrels with Lessing and La Beaumelle.—He falls out with Maupertuis,—a former friend of Mme du Châtelet,—and the President of the Berlin Academy of Sciences.—The *Diatribe du docteur Akakia*, 1752.—Frederick has the pamphlet burned by the public executioner.—Voltaire's anger, humiliation, and submission [Cf. Correspondence, Preuss' edition, 1752–1753];—he decides to ask for leave of absence on the plea that he desires to drink the waters at Plombières;—Frederick eagerly grants his request;—and accepts Voltaire's resignation of his title of "Chamberlain to the King of Prussia."—Voltaire's departure, March 26, 1753.—The Frankfort incident.—He makes successive stays at Strasburg, Colmar, Lyons and Geneva.

Voltaire's historical works.—Voltaire's two principal historical works belong to this period of his life:—the *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, of which the first edition was issued in Berlin in 1751;—and the *Essai sur les mœurs*, of which the first edition under this title appeared at Geneva in 1756;—though it was eleven years earlier that the *Mercure de*

Alexandrian library, it would have sufficed to console us for the loss of the others."

II

One of the consequences of these new principles is, that there being scarcely anything in the world less "literary" in its essence than the Encyclopedia of d'Alembert and Diderot, the work scarcely belongs to the history of literature. For this reason we shall not relate here how the French Encyclopedia, originally conceived as a mere translation of the Cyclopedia of Ephraim Chambers, developed into the most important piece of publishing enterprise that had as yet been seen, nor how circumstances, far more than men, converted what was at first

---

France had begun to publish detached passages of the work.—The *Annales de l'Empire* (1753) also belong to this period;—as too does the definite edition of *Charles XII.*, the date of which is 1756–1757.—The two first-mentioned works introduced a new method of writing history into European literature.

In Voltaire's hands history, which had previously been the work of mere annalists or had been purely polemical, became in the first place *narrative* in the true sense of the word, and by this is implied:—the exercise of choice as regards the subject and the choosing of a subject of general interest and not of interest to the learned only;—the use of discrimination as regards the facts to receive mention, those which merely obstruct the narrative, or are useless and uninviting, being eliminated;—and a continuity of interest only obtainable by recourse to art and intentionally.—This amounts to saying that whereas history before Voltaire's time had been *erudite* or *learned*, in his hands it became, in the second place, *literary*, and by this is implied:—the paying attention to style and to the arrangement of the component parts;—the constant reminding the reader of the interest offered by past events to the living generation;—and in consequence a perpetual invitation to the reader to exercise his faculty of thought.—Finally, history which had been *indifferent to its own subject matter* became a purely commercial undertaking into the most formidable weapon of offence that had hitherto been forged against tradition. Furthermore we shall not attempt to determine the general or central idea of the work, an idea which doubtless was never particularly "general" as conceived by the jejune, rigid and narrow mind of d'Alembert or particularly clear as reflected in the nebulous brain of Diderot [Cf. in Diderot's works his article *Encyclopédie*]. The number of writers engaged in carrying out the scheme could not fail to be an additional source of obscurity; masterpieces are never the outcome of the combined efforts of two authors and still less of those of several. Finally, in spite of the anecdotal interest of the story, we shall not narrate how the Encyclopedia, after multiple incidents and many successive "suppressions," developed into the monumental compilation of which Lord Chester-

in Voltaire's hands *philosophic*, by which is implied:—the subordination of facts to the consequences in which they resulted;—the appreciation of these facts in the light of a given ideal:—and the basing of this ideal on a given conception of life and of humanity.

The disadvantages of this mode of understanding history;—and that Voltaire himself was not uninfluenced by them.

The disadvantages of treating history *philosophically* are:—the substitution, when judging men and things, of the authority of an abstract criterion for the sentiment of the diversity that distinguishes the different epochs;—the putting all history in this way on the same level;—and in consequence the distorting or perversion of history.—Voltaire's respect for *literary* considerations makes no less for historical misrepresentation;—if the importance of historical events has nothing to do with the possibility of presenting them under an attractive guise;—if the interest the events may have for posterity is at any rate no measure of their importance;—and if nothing is more calculated to obscure the true significance of a period than the desire to present it in such a manner as shall please our contemporaries.—Finally Voltaire's method offers disadvantages in so far as it is *narrative*;—if the choice of the facts to be dwelled on ought not to depend on the caprice of the historian;—if there are "subjects which make a field said, in a letter to his son who had asked him whether he should make its acquisition:

"You will buy it, my son, and seated on it you will read *Candide*." On the other hand, since even at the present day a regrettable confusion is often made between "the spirit of the Encyclopedia" and "the classic spirit," recalling that which was long made between the spirit of the Reformation and the spirit of the Renaissance; since there has even been a disposition to regard the encyclopedic spirit as the final and in some sort preordained expression, as the necessary outcome of the classic spirit; for these reasons an effort must be made to dissipate this confusion, and to show that while there may perhaps be one or two features in common between the encyclopedic and the classic spirit, as there were between the spirit of the Renaissance and that of the Reformation, in

claim upon the attention" and it is "impossible to make the straining of the attention other than a laborious effort";—and if, finally, there are no useless or cumbersome facts in history,—but merely facts of which we do not perceive the significance.

How the accumulation by Voltaire of all these defects,—defects aggravated moreover by his very success,—reduced his other histories his *Histoire du Parlement* (1769) for example—to the rank of mere pamphlets;—and thus degraded history till it became the mere instrument of his philosophic passions.—History, like tragedy, demands to be treated for its own sake;—but this does not prevent the *Essai sur les mœurs*;—and above all the *Siècle de Louis XIV.* being epoch-making works in the art of writing history;—or Voltaire himself from having exerted on the direction taken by historical studies,—almost as considerable an influence as on the drama itself, and perhaps indeed an influence even more considerable.

Voltaire takes up his residence at the villa Délices, 1755.—Publication of the poems *La loi naturelle* and *Le Désastre de Lisbonne*, 1756;—Rousseau addresses him his letter on the subject of Providence. —Voltaire's difficulties with the authorities of Geneva.—He suggests to d'Alembert the article on Geneva printed in the Encyclopedia.—Renewed intervention of Rousseau in the quarrel [Cf. above, p. 320].

every other respect they offer nothing but opposition and contradiction.

For example, " the classic spirit " only took shape by dint of freeing itself, and at the same time Frenchmen and French literature, from all foreign influence. The "encyclopedic spirit," on the contrary, attained to self-consciousness, as has just been seen, owing to the quickening action of English thought. What is more, after failing to recognise its harbingers in Descartes and Bayle, it preferred to trace its origin to Locke and Bacon. Who is unaware that, in a certain sense, the *Esprit des Lois* is merely a glorification of the English Constitution? The case is the same with the *Traité des sensations*, which is nothing more than an " adaptation " of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding. The *Encyclopédie* itself, as we remarked above, was intended originally to

—Purchase of Ferney, 1758.—*Candide*, 1759 ;—*Tancrède*, 1760 ;—the *Ecossaise*, 1760 ;—and, in this connection, of the rôle of Fréron [Cf. Ch. Nisard, *Les ennemis de Voltaire*].—At the same period Voltaire writes what we possess of his Memoirs [Cf. Beuchot's edition, vol. xl.]. —A few skits of indifferent value : the *Relation de la maladie et de la mort du Père Berthier*, 1759 ;—*Les Quand*, 1760, a rejoinder to an academical discourse in which Lefranc de Pompignan had attacked the philosophers ;—his *Dialogues chrétiens*, 1760 ;—and a more important work, the *Extrait des sentiments de Jean Meslier*, 1762,—cause him to be ranked definitely as the unquestioned leader of the philosophic party.—The *Éloge de Crébillon*, 1762 ;—the *Commentaire sur Corneille*,—and the *Recueil de pièces originales concernant la mort des sieurs Calas*, 1762.

VI.—After the suppression of the Encyclopedia.

How the issue of the Encyclopedia was proceeded with in spite of its " suppression " ;—thanks to the protection of M. de Malesherbes, who had supreme control over the printing and publishing of books ; —of M. de Sartine, Lieutenant of Police ;—and of Mme de Pompadour ; —and also because the Government was influenced by the importance of the material interests involved in the enterprise.—The consideration be a mere translation of an English work; while as to Diderot, who has undoubtedly some pretensions to be regarded as the incarnation of the encyclopedic spirit, there is nothing that is not English in the work of a writer, who is still often termed the "most German" of Frenchmen. He began by translating Stanyan's History of Greece; his *Essai sur le mérite et la vertu* is a mere paraphrase of Shaftesbury; while he imitates Richardson and Sterne in his stories and novels, and Moore and Lillo in his dramas or his middle-class tragedies. . . . It would be superfluous to multiply the examples! Seeing, however, that the foreigner is now translated or appealed to as a source of inspiration with an ardour equal to that with which the imitation of him was formerly avoided, can it be said that no change has occurred? is it possible to consider this different disposition as the effect of the same causes?

of the Government went further still;—as is proved by the incident in connection with the comedy *Les Philosophes* (May, 1760);—and yet more so by that in connection with the *Ecossaise* (July, 1760),—if it be a fact that Fréron, whom Voltaire had grossly insulted by name came very near to being prevented from replying to him in the *Année littéraire* [Cf. Desnoiresterres, *La comédie satirique au XVIII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1885].—That this tolerance of the Government was not unconnected with the fear of seeing an undertaking forbidden in France brought to a successful conclusion abroad, in Berlin perhaps or in St. Petersburg;—and further with the necessity the authorities were under of making some concessions to the philosophers,—on the eve of the expulsion of the Jesuits, 1762.—D'Alembert's work: *De la destruction des Jésuites en France*;—and that it is curious to note that its publication coincided with the issue of the last ten volumes of the Encyclopedia.—Remarks on this subject;—and of the difficulty of circulating ten folio volumes clandestinely.—Comparative indifference amid which they appeared;—and that this indifference was natural;—seeing that they contained scarcely anything that had not been touched on, to say the least, in the first seven volumes;—and that these first seven volumes had realised all the effect that could be expected from the work.

And if the answer is negative from both an historical and a logical point of view, a first difference is perceived between the "encyclopedic spirit" and the "classic spirit."

A second difference lies in the fact that whereas the classic spirit, from the time of Ronsard to that of Boileau, for a hundred and fifty or two hundred years, had displayed the utmost respect for the ancients and for tradition, the very essence of the encyclopedic spirit, on the contrary, is contempt for the ancients and hatred of tradition. These terms are not too strong. The encyclopedists not only did not appreciate the ancients; they despised them. They regarded as a mere prejudice, as a foolish prejudice, not to say as mere pedantic hypocrisy, the admiration which some few humanists still ventured to profess for Virgil and

VII.—**Claude-Adrien Helvétius** [Paris, 1715; † 1771, Paris].

His father and grandfather were doctors;—he becomes a farmer of the taxes and a patron of literature;—steward to Queen Marie Leczinska;—beset with a desire for celebrity, he starts by acquiring a reputation as a dandy.—He next essays poetry;—and submits his efforts to Voltaire;—who encourages him by reminding him that Atticus was a farmer of the taxes;—though at the same time he declares the poems somewhat commonplace.—Helvétius then turns his attention to mathematics;—and finally to philosophy.—He resigns his post of farmer of the taxes, and with much labour composes his book *De l'Esprit*, 1758.—Mediocrity of the book in general.—The worst paradoxes are propounded in it on the strength of proofs;—which for the most part are mere scandalous "anecdotes";—in spite of which no book has made more noise in its time;—or spread abroad more ideas destined to make their way in the world.—Helvétius was the first writer to declare "that ethics ought to be treated according to the methods of experimental physics." [Cf. *De l'Esprit*, Discourse ii., chap. 15];—that moral questions are at bottom merely social questions,—"since the vices of a people always lie hid in its legislation" [Cf. *De l'Esprit*, Discourse ii., chap. 15];

Homer. "At one time I was made to believe that I took a pleasure in reading Homer,—are the words the author of *Candide* puts in the mouth of the senator Pococurante,—but this perpetual repetition of combats . . . bored me beyond measure. It has happened to me to ask the learned whether they, too, found Homer tedious reading. . . . *All of them who were sincere confessed that the work could not hold their attention an instant*, though it was necessary to have it in a library as a monument of antiquity, just as one preserved those rusty coins that have lost all commercial value" [Cf. *Candide*, chap. 25]. Let a comparison be made between this quotation from *Candide* and the following passage from the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* [Cf. part iii., chap. 5]: "One of the reasons of the enthusiasm aroused by the poetry of Homer is the fact that he

—and further that there is nothing education cannot accomplish [Cf. *De l'Esprit*, Discourse iii.].—Sensation aroused by the book.—Helvétius makes a full and pitiful retractation;—and afterwards remains silent;—and disappears from the literary scene.

VIII.—**Fréderic-Melchior Grimm** [Ratisbon, 1723; † 1807, Gotha].

Grimm's classical and philosophic culture;—his first literary efforts and his tragedy *Banise* (in German).—His arrival in Paris;—his relations with Diderot, Rousseau, and the society of which Mme d'Epinay was the centre, 1749-1750.—His two Letters on German Literature [Cf. *Mercure de France*, 1751];—the letter on the subject of *Omphale* [Destouches' opera], 1752;—and the *Petit prophète de Bœhmischbroda*, 1753 [Cf. Adolphe Jullien, *La Musique et les Philosophes au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1873].—The *Correspondance littéraire* [1754-1790];—and that it is inseparable from the encyclopedic movement,—of which it was for fifteen or twenty years what may be called the secret official organ in Europe.—What Grimm and the numerous assistants who worked under his supervision really did,—was to make accessible to the German sovereigns, his subscribers,—the ideas of the "corporation of philosophers";—while sang the victories and advantages scored by Greece over Asia. On the side of Asia was Venus, the emblem of pleasure, of profligate passion and of effeminacy; on the side of Greece were Juno, the grave patroness of conjugal love, Mercury, the god of eloquence, and Jupiter, who personifies political wisdom. On the side of Asia was the impetuous and brutal Mars, or war conducted with fury; on the side of Greece was Pallas, that is the military art and valour guided by intelligence. . . . From this moment Greece . . . could not suffer that Asia should harbour the thought of effecting her conquest, for had she submitted to this yoke she would have seemed to make virtue subject to profligacy, the mind to the body, and true courage to an unreasoning force residing solely in numbers." The light in which the classic spirit regarded the masterpieces of antiquity has never been

---

contriving with great skill to soften down what there was in these ideas that might not have been to the liking of princes;—by dint of showing the ideas in such a light as to make the sovereigns regard them as a means of destroying the hindrances that still stood between them and absolute power.—On the other hand, as the *Correspondance* was not published until 1812, this is not the place to judge it on its merits;—and it will suffice to have noted to what extent it contributed to the encyclopedic propaganda.

IX.—The Encyclopedic Propaganda.

Financial success of the undertaking.—There were 4,800 subscribers in 1750.—Foundation of the *Journal encyclopédique*, 1756;—its editor, P. Rousseau (of Toulouse) and his co-workers;—its wide circulation.—Centres of the encyclopedic influence in Paris: Mme de Geoffrin's *salon* [Cf. *Mémoires de Marmontel*; and P. de Ségur, *Le royaume de la rue Saint-Honoré*, Paris, 1897];—Mme d'Epinay's group [Cf. *Mémoires de Mme d'Epinay*, Boiteau's edition, Paris, 1863; and L. Perey and G. Maugras, *La jeunesse de Mme d'Epinay*, Paris, 1882];—Baron d'Holbach's group [Cf. Diderot, *Correspondance avec Mlle Volland*; and d'Avezac-Lavigne, *La société du baron d'Holbach*, Paris, 1875];—and Mlle de Lespinasse and her friends [Cf.

better defined: masterpieces it looked on as lessons in social morality presented under the guise of poetic fictions. The encyclopedists considered these fictions as mere trifling, and were blind to the lesson they convey. Tradition, too, in their eyes, in literature and in every other sphere, is only an impediment, bred of superstition, to their freedom of thought, to the "diffusion of enlightenment," and to the progress of reason. "It is by weakening the foolish veneration of the masses for ancient laws and customs," writes Helvétius, "that sovereigns will be enabled to rid the earth of the greater number of the evils that afflict it, and to assure the duration of their empires" [Cf. *De l'Esprit*, 2nd discourse, ch. 17]. His meaning surely is that emancipation from tradition is the very essence of progress. And shall we not admit that there is certainly a difference

her correspondence].—How the very adversaries of the Encyclopedia served its cause;—and in particular Palissot and Fréron;—who were always referring to it;—and often for no other reason than with a view to filling their papers.—Spread of the encyclopedic ideas among the lower middle class [Cf. *Correspondance de Mme Roland avec les demoiselles Cannet*];—and doubtless even in the provinces;—although it is impossible to give trustworthy proof of the fact [Cf. however the letters of Mme Butet in J. Cruppi's work, *L'avocat Linguet*, Paris, 1895].—There is proof, on the other hand, of the spread of the ideas abroad;—in the district of which Liège is the centre, for instance [Cf. Francotte, *La propagande encyclopédique*, chap. ii. and iii.; and Küntziger, *Les encyclopédistes français en Belgique*, chap. iv.];—in Switzerland, where the 28 volumes of the original work were thrice reprinted;—in Italy, where the work was twice reprinted, once at Leghorn and once at Lucca;—in Germany and Russia by the intermediary of Grimm.—How this propaganda necessarily contributed to the diffusion of French ideas;—and indirectly to the formation of a European literature.

THE WORKS.

The only works of importance of Grimm and Helvétius are those mentioned above.

between appealing in everything to the authority of tradition and treating it persistently as an obstacle and an enemy?

How many other differences of a moral or philosophic and even of a political order would it be possible, would it be a duty to point out, were it not for the fear that to indicate them might seem somewhat beyond the scope of a history of literature! While the classic spirit had in general regarded the instincts and passions with proper suspicion, the encyclopedic spirit, on the contrary, made insolent and cynical profession of the trust it placed in them. "A man becomes stupid when he ceases to be passionate," writes Helvétius [Cf. *De l'Esprit*, 3rd discourse, ch. 8]. In Diderot's eyes the vice of "all political, civil, and religious institutions" is that they have "instilled men with the poison of a morality contrary to

---

In the case of Diderot, on the contrary, while his writings for the Encyclopedia are not the least portion of his work, and still less the portion which has had the least influence, they are not the most considerable and in particular not the most original portion. On the other hand, almost all his most vaunted writings only appeared after his death, for which reason we did not think it proper to deal with them in the article devoted to him. It is necessary to bear in mind that Diderot's contemporaries were acquainted neither with the *Religieuse*, the *Neveu de Rameau*, the *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, the *Rêve de d'Alembert*, nor the *Salons*; and in face of this fact how is it possible to discuss the effect of the writings in question on the thought of the period? Since, however, this is still too often done, we shall proceed to classify Diderot's works in the chronological order of their publication, which is the order followed in the general divisions adopted in the edition of Assézat and Maurice Tourneux.

1. BELLES-LETTRES [Novels, Plays, Criticism and History].—*Les bijoux indiscrets*, 1748;—*Le Fils naturel*, 1757;—*Le Père de famille*, preceded by a Discourse on Dramatic Poetry, 1758;—*Essai sur la vie de Sénèque . . . et sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron*, 1778;—*La Religieuse*, 1796;—*Jacques le fataliste*, 1796;—*Ceci n'est pas un conte*,

nature" [Cf. *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*]. The Cartesian tenet which the classic spirit had combatted most energetically had been the dogma, new at the time, of the omnipotence and sovereignty of reason, of that reason which opines "that two and two make four," which denies, when it does not take a pleasure in scoffing at, whatever is outside the range of its deductions. "Be silent, foolish reason!" Pascal had said. The encyclopedic spirit, on the contrary, regarded reason as the sole source of truth; and the many things in the world that appeared to it to be "irrational," proclaiming the antagonism between the world and reason, it decided that a work of destruction was its most immediate concern. Again, the classic spirit esteemed that laws are a reflection of morals, or in other words that the public good is secured by the combined action of

---

1798;—*Le Neveu de Rameau*, 1823;—*Paradoxe sur le comédien*, 1830.

2. ART CRITICISM.—The *Salons*, of which the dates of publication were as follows: *Salon* of 1761, 1819;—*Salon* of 1763, 1857;—*Salon* of 1765, 1795;—*Salon* of 1767, 1798;—*Salon* of 1769, 1819, and 1857;—*Salon* of 1771, 1857;—*Salon* of 1775, 1857;—*Salon* of 1781, 1857.

3. PHILOSOPHY.—*Essai sur le mérite et la vertu*, 1745;—*Pensées philosophiques*, 1746;—*Lettre sur les aveugles*, 1749;—*Lettre sur les sourds et muets*, 1751;—*Apologie de l'abbé de Prades*, 1752 [Part iii. only];—*Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature*, 1754;—*Supplément au voyage de Bougainville*, 1796;—*Le rêve de d'Alembert*, 1830;—*La Promenade du sceptique*, 1830.

4. *Plan d'une université pour le gouvernement de Russie*, 1813–1814.

5. We also possess sundry scientific works by Diderot, the value of which does not appear to be very great;—and an extremely interesting but unfortunately incomplete Correspondence, the most curious portions of which are the letters addressed to Falconet and the correspondence with Mlle Volland.

The best and most complete edition of Diderot's works is that of MM. Assézat and Maurice Tourneux, 20 vols. in 8vo, Paris, 1875–1877, Garnier frères.

the best efforts of the individual members of society, whereas the encyclopedic spirit spread abroad the idea that "if the laws are good, morals will be good, and if the laws are bad, morals will be bad." It is thus that Diderot expresses himself in another passage of his *Supplément au voyage de Bougainville.* Helvétius emits a like opinion, picked up doubtless in one of the *salons* of the period: "The vices of a people always lie hidden deep down in its legislation; it is there that search must be made with a view to extirpating the root from which a people's vices spring up" [Cf. *De l'Esprit,* 2nd discourse, ch. 15]. And since this irreconcilable opposition or even contradiction between the classic spirit and the encyclopedic spirit is thus everywhere patent, is it not natural enough that we should again meet with it in literature?

The principal literary works of d'Alembert in addition to the *Discours préliminaire de l'Encyclopédie*, 1750, are;—his pamphlet *La destruction des Jésuites en France*, 1765;—some translations;—a few short writings,—and the valuable series of his *Éloges Académiques*, 1779–1787.

NINTH PERIOD

From the Encyclopedia to the "Genie du Christianisme"

1765–1800

I.—**Jean-Jacques Rousseau** [Geneva, 1712; † 1778, Ermenonville].

1. THE SOURCES.—Almost all the works of Rousseau himself, and particularly his *Confessions*; his *Dialogues* (*Rousseau, juge de Jean-Jacques*); the *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*; and his Correspondence;—Mme d'Epinay's Memoirs;—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*;—Fréron, *Année littéraire*, 1754–1776;—Diderot, *Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron*;—Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Fragmens* and *Essai sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau.*

That this is indeed the case is naïvely admitted by d'Alembert in the preliminary notice he wrote for the Encyclopedia. "*Abuse is made of the best things.* That philosophic spirit, so much in the fashion at the present day, which demands conviction and spurns hypothesis, has spread even to literature: it is even asserted that its influence on literature is harmful, *and it is difficult to hide from oneself that the accusation is well-founded.* Our century seems desirous of applying rigid and didactic methods of discussion to matters of sentiment." But, given the definition he himself offers of the philosophic spirit,—defining it, that is, as a taste for "analysis" and "combination"—what was likely to become even of psychological observation, let alone of poetry or of eloquence? I have somewhere asserted, I believe, that a wider and above all a deeper knowledge of man is

Musset-Pathay, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de J. J. Rousseau*, Paris, 1821;—G. H. Morin, *Essai sur la vie et le caractère de J. J. Rousseau*, Paris, 1851;—Saint-Marc Girardin, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau, sa vie et ses ouvrages*, Paris, 1848, 1851, 1852, 1856 and 1875;—Streckeisen-Moultou, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ses amis et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1865;—John Morley, *Rousseau*, London, 1873;—F. Brockerhoff, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Leipsic, 1863–1874;—*Jean-Jacques Rousseau jugé par les Genevois d'aujourd'hui*, Paris and Geneva, 1878;—H. Beaudouin, *La vie et les ouvres de J. J. Rousseau*, Paris, 1891.

These works, which are of a somewhat general character, should be completed, checked, and connected by the more special investigations of M. Eugène Ritter; *La famille de J. J. Rousseau*, 1878; *Nouvelles recherches sur les confessions*, 1880; *La jeunesse de J. J. Rousseau*, 1896;—of M. Albert Jansen: *Rousseau als Musiker*, 1884; *Rousseau als Botaniker*, 1885; *Documents sur J. J. Rousseau*, 1885;—of M. Fritz Berthoud, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau au Val de Travers*, 1881; *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et le Pasteur de Montmollin*, 1884;—of M. G. Maugras, *Voltaire et Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 1886;—of M. P. J. Möbius, *Rousseau's Krankheits-geschichte*, Leipsic, 1889;—of M. Châtelain, *La Folie de Rousseau*, 1890;—of M. F. Mugnier, *Madame* displayed in the memoirs of the least important writers of the time of the Fronde, of any petty woman author of the seventeenth century,—in the memoirs of Mme de Motteville, or in Mme de La Fayette's *Histoire de Madame Henriette*,—than in the whole Encyclopedia. The reason for this fact is now perhaps plain. It is that the Encyclopedists did not concern themselves with the study either of man in general or of men individually, but solely with the study of the "relations between men"; and the exclusive study of the "relations between men" speedily leads to the losing sight of the diversity of nature by which men are distinguished from one another. Voltaire and d'Alembert are examples in point. The former declares in disparagement of Racine that his Hippolytes and his Achilles are all of them much alike [Cf. *Le Temple du*

---

de Warens et Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1891;—of H. H. de Montel, *Mme de Warens et le pays de Vaud*, Lausanne, 1891.

Consult as well: Mme de Staël, *Lettres sur les ouvrages et le caractère de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 1788; — Villemain, *Tableau de la littérature française au XVIII^e^ siècle*, 1828–1840;— Lord Brougham, *Voltaire and Rousseau*, 1845;—Louis Blanc, *Révolution française*, vol. ii., 1847;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vols. ii., iii., xv., 1850–1861; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. ix., 1864;—Vinet, *Littérature française au XVIII^e^ siècle*, 1853;—Ernest Bersot, *Études sur le XVIII^e^ siècle*, 1855;—Taine, *Ancien régime*, 1875, and *La Révolution*, vol. ii., 1881;—J. Texte, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les origines de cosmopolitisme littéraire*, Paris, 1895.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.

A. *The character of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.*—Of the absolute conformity between the writings and the character of Rousseau;—and that his *Emile* and even his *Nouvelle Héloïse* are in reality memoirs and confessions in which the "romance" element is of the slightest;—Rousseau's extraction;—his birth and education;—his adventurous youth;—his precocious, varied and bitter experience of life.—Rousseau's psychology:—(1) *The Plebeian*;—and that this first feature of *goût*], and the latter is astonished that Marivaux "was so successful a dramatic writer, seeing that he is always giving what is practically the same comedy under different titles" [Cf. *Éloge de Marivaux*]. In their eyes the delicate, penetrating and subtle psychology of these authors is so much "metaphysics," which amounts to saying that it is little better than gibberish. They are blind to the fine distinctions between the characters. When they do not perceive a distinction they deny its existence without further scruple, while if they happen to detect one they dismiss it as mere "hair-splitting." Who will be astonished, under these circumstances, that there is no trace of psychology in Voltaire's tragedies, in *Sémiramis*, in the *Orphelin*, or in *Tancrède*? that there is still less, if possible, in those of his disciple Marmontel? in the *Incas* or in *Bélisaire*? and generally

---

his character accounts for:—the innate simplicity of his tastes;—his affectation of coarseness;—the turbid and passionate nature of his style;—the violence of his hatreds;—the nature of his pride, which is the pride of a self-taught or self-made man;—his contempt for cultured wit, which he considers an aristocratic quality;—his incorrigible optimism;—and finally the depth of some of his views.—(2) *His sensitiveness*;—and that this second feature of his character accounts for:—the ease with which the slightest pleasure or the slightest pain makes an impression on him;—the quickness with which he gives himself over entirely to the impression of the moment;—the perpetual vibration of his style;—his habitual inability to control his ideas;—the contradictions in which his work abounds;—and the early weakness and final atrophy of his will.—(3) *The Madman*, that is to say "the neurasthenic and the lipamaniac" [Cf. Möbius, *op. cit.*];—and that this last characteristic accounts for:—the incoherency of his conduct;—the ease with which he took offence even at kindness shown him;—his suspicion of everybody;—the suddenness of his quarrels [Cf. Eug. Ritter, *Nouvelles Recherches*];—his naïve egoism;—and the eccentricities of his later years.—Importance of this last feature;—if it was impossible that it should not manifest itself in his works in the shape of a disposition to literary morbidness;—and that the entire literature of the Encyclopedists, on account of its philosophic trend, should be wanting in nothing so much as in reality, substance, and life?

Like exception must be taken to the language of the Encyclopedists. Everybody is acquainted with Voltaire's Commentary on Corneille, and is aware of the timidity of taste to which the work bears instructive and melancholy testimony! In the opinion of d'Alembert, "the prefaces of Racine are weakly written," and those of Corneille are as "excellent as regards the matter as they are *defective in respect to the style*" [*Mélanges littéraires*, art. *Elocution*]. Condorcet, too, will complain a few years later "of finding in the *Provinciales* too many familiar and proverbial expressions, which appear at present to be deficient in elevation" [Cf. *Éloge de Pascal*]. In reality, in spite of their professed admiration for "the models,"

if it thus comes about that what was perhaps, in more than one respect, mere corruption;—has been taken for an innovation in literature and art.

B. *The Early Career of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.*—The novels of La Calprenède and Plutarch's Lives are his earliest reading.—His departure for Geneva and his life of adventure.—The experience he acquires in the servants' hall and while tramping the roads;—his liaison with Mme de Warens;—his life at Charmettes, 1738–1741;—and, in this connection, of the novel Flaubert has entitled *L'éducation sentimentale.*—Rousseau at Lyons.—His first stay in Paris, 1741:—his system of musical notation;—the beginning of his intercourse with Grimm and Diderot.—His stay in Venice, 1743–1744 [Cf. P. Faugère in the *Correspondant* for June 10 and 25, 1888];—and his quarrel with his patron, M. de Montaigu.—His return to Paris.—He remodels the *Princesse de Navarre* of Voltaire [*Les Fêtes de Ramire*], with whom he is brought into contact in consequence, 1745.—He becomes secretary to Mme Dupin, 1746 [Cf. *Le Portefeuille de Mme Dupin*, edited by M. de Villeneuve-Guibert, Paris, 1884];—the representation of the *Muses galantes*, 1747.—He makes the acquaintance of Mme d'Epinay [Cf. Mme d'Epinay's Memoirs, L. Perey and G. Maugras' edition, Paris, 1882;—and Edmond Scherer, *Madame* they are convinced at bottom that the progress made in the domain of thought owing to the action of the philosophic spirit has extended insensibly to the art of writing. And the fact is that the straightforward and somewhat rugged but rich, unconstrained, familiar and yet eloquent language of the past has undergone a change with a view to the necessities of their propaganda. There has been introduced, or rather they have introduced, not indeed more order than existed in the old language, but a different, an inverse order, an order too that is very distinct from that which prevailed at the beginning of the century, a genuinely "encyclopedic" order, algebraic instead of merely logical. Words in their eyes have become mere conventional, artificial, and arbitrary signs; sentences mere "multinomials" to be "ordered" in accordance with certain

d'Epinay, in his *Études*, 1866];—and, in this connection, of the indulgence shown by the biographers of Mme d'Epinay.—Rousseau contributes to the Encyclopedia.—The Dijon discourse, 1749;—and the conditions under which Rousseau wrote it [Cf. Rousseau's version in his *Confessions*; Diderot's in his *Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron*; and those of Morellet and Marmontel in their Memoirs].—Prodigious success of the Discourse, 1751;—and that this success must be attributed to a warmth of eloquence to which the public had been unaccustomed for half a century;—to the unexpected assistance furnished the enemies of the Encyclopedists by the Discourse;—and to the conformity between its tendencies and the spirit of reaction against the artificial character of the civilisation of the century, which was beginning to show itself;—the preface to *Narcisse*, 1752;—the *Devin du village*, 1752;—the article on Political Economy for the Encyclopedia, 1755;—the *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité*, 1755.—Rousseau's journey to Geneva, and his reconversion to Protestantism.—His return to Paris.—He takes up his residence at the Ermitage, 1756.—The *Lettre sur la Providence*, 1756.—Rousseau and Mme d'Houdetot, 1756–1758.—Rousseau's early dissensions with Grimm and Diderot.—The article on Geneva in the Encyclopedia, 1757.—Rousseau replies to it by his *Lettre sur les* rules; while they regard style as merely the equation of pure thought. Indeed, in their estimation progress consisted in the impoverishing of the vocabulary, in imposing a more rigorous syntax, in the abuse of "general terms," and in the subordination of individual originality to the exigences of the public. Condorcet has admitted as much in so many words: "The necessity has been felt that a literary style should be more elevated and more sustained than the language of conversation. . . . Conversation itself has adopted a nobler tone . . . and it may be that we owe to conversation the advantage of possessing at this period of our literature,—he writes in 1776,—a greater number of men of letters who write with charm and elegance" [Cf. *Éloge de Pascal*].

The more attentively these facts are considered, the more difficult it becomes to regard the formation or

---

spectacles, 1758.—Marmontel's rejoinder.—Rousseau's definite rupture with the philosophic party.—His new liaisons with the Maréchale de Luxembourg, the Comtesse de Boufflers, the Marquise de Créqui and Mme de Verdelin.—He takes up his residence at Montmorency, 1758.

C. *Rousseau's Chief Works.*—(1) *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 1761 [Cf. *Lettres inédites de Rousseau à Marc-Michel Rey*, Paris, 1858].—The real sources of the novel;—the Swiss background [Cf. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et le pays romand*];—Rousseau's passion for Mme d'Houdetot [Cf. Lucien Brunel, *La Nouvelle Héloïse et Mme d'Houdetot*, Paris, 1888].—His imitation of *Clarissa Harlowe*;—and of Marivaux' novels.—The moral purpose of the book;—and that, to judge it equitably, it is only necessary to compare it with the salacious productions of the younger Crébillon.—The novelty of the surroundings in which the scene of the book is laid;—and that its primary merit at the time of its issue was that it was not a "Parisian novel" [Cf. the novels of Crébillon, Duclos, and Marivaux].—The personages of the book belong not only to the middle classes, but to the provinces;—though their adventures are not the less tragic on that account.—The incidents are of a psychological order instead of being incidents in the lives of the personages [Cf. the novels of Prévost and Le Sage].—Further, the novel which had hitherto been looked development of the encyclopedic spirit as the natural outcome of the classic spirit. One is tempted rather to regard them as contrary to each other. If it were under the influence of any general idea that the Encyclopedists gathered round d'Alembert and Diderot in the room behind Lebreton's bookshop or in the apartment of the Rue Taranne, if their association were prompted by some definite design, their purpose was to change the trend of the French genius; and on the whole their efforts were crowned with success. In art as in philosophy, in literature as in morals, their attitude was just the contrary of that of Corneille, Racine, Pascal, Bossuet, La Bruyère, and Boileau. Their wish was to overthrow the ideal that had formerly obtained; and this being the case, of what importance are some dozens of tragedies whose mediocre authors imagined that their imitations of *Andromaque*

---

upon as an inferior branch of literature,—is regarded by the author of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* as a vehicle of thought on a par with tragedy itself;—and, in this connection, of the abuse of digressions in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*.—Finally nature occupies less space in the work than man;—but more space than had customarily been allotted it in works of art;—and if the style of the book is not absolutely new, it is widely different from the style of the period;—owing to the warmth and movement that animate it;—owing to the imprint it bears of the personality of the writer;—and finally owing to its tone, which is not purely oratorical, but lyric as well.—Divided opinion of the critics on the *Nouvelle Héloïse* [Cf. Voltaire, *Lettres sur la Nouvelle Héloïse*, Beuchot's edition, vol. xl.; Fréron, *Année littéraire*, 1761, vol. ii.; Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*, February, 1761];—and success of the novel among the general public [Cf. Rousseau, *Confessions*, bk. xi.].

(2) The *Contrat social*, 1762 [Cf. *Lettres inédites* cited above; J. Hornung, *Les idées politiques de Rousseau*, 1878; and André Lichtenberger, *Le socialisme au XVIII^e siècle*, 1895];—and that to appreciate the work properly it must be borne in mind that Rousseau was a plebeian;—a Protestant,—who had been brought up to believe in the sovereignty of the people;—and finally a native of Geneva.—To

were improvements on the original? It only remains to add that the influence of the Encyclopedists was at once aided and thwarted by another influence of which it is an extremely delicate task to define the nature: I refer to the influence of Rousseau; and it is doubtful whether there had been a more considerable or more revolutionary influence since that exerted by Pascal.

III

Stultos facit fortuna quos vult perdere! and in truth it would be hard to explain the progress, the vogue and, following a moment of uncertainty at the out-

---

what extent Rousseau's conception of the Social Contract was influenced by the constitution of Geneva;—and how by taking an ideal view of this constitution,—it appeared to him as even more tyrannical than it actually was.—That the citizen of Geneva in the eighteenth century was not to be envied.—Rousseau's unconscious Calvinism [Cf. Jurieu, *Lettres pastorales*; and Bossuet, *Avertissements aux protestants*];—and, in this connection, of Calvin's fundamental error in the domain of politics;—which consists in his having made a confusion between the rights of religion and those of the government;—and in his having mixed up the object of government with that of morality.—The traces of Rousseau's plebeianism in the *Contrat social*;—and that they are seen more especially in his incapacity to understand the social function of inequality.—Rousseau's three dogmas;—universal equality;—the sovereignty of the people;—the omnipotence of the State.—Individualism and Socialism;—and how it has come about that while some people regard Rousseau as a forefather of "revolutionary socialism,"—others praise him "for having made the independence of the individual the firm basis" of his philosophy [Cf. as regards the numerous contradictions on this head. Lichtenberger's book referred to above, pp. 129 and 130].—The explanation of these conflicting views lies first of all in the fact that it has been overlooked that the essential characteristics of his dialectics,—or of his rhetoric,—is the set, the rapid spread of the encyclopedic doctrine, were we to overlook how this result was furthered to the most regrettably imprudent or the most signally foolish extent by all those whose interests the doctrine threatened: by the very adversaries of the Encyclopedia, by the Government, and in particular by the *salons*.

Unmeasured praise has been bestowed on the famous and vaunted *salons* of the century with which we are dealing. While it has become the custom to expend nothing but raillery on the *ruelles* of the preceding century, and to adopt, in referring to them, the tone of Molière in his *Précieuses ridicules* or in his *Femmes savantes*, we are all indulgence and complaisancy even at the present day for the charmers who, like Mme de Tencin or Mme d'Epinay, had the art to combine looseness of

---

giving eloquent expression to aggressive paradoxes;—whose consequences he at once proceeds to attenuate;—in the further fact that his socialism is only a means to an end which is individualism;—and we find the same contradiction exists for the same reason in the socialism of the present day;—when Anarchists seemingly make common cause with Collectivists;—although their respective ideals are utterly contradictory;—and finally in the fact that Rousseau does not boggle at contradicting himself;—if indeed it can be said that he even perceives his self-contradictions.

(3) *Emile*, 1762 [Cf. *Lettres inédites*, cited above; *Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ses amis et ses ennemis*, vol. ii.; and Gabriel Compayré, *Histoire des théories de l'éducation en France*, 1885].—Wide-spread interest taken in educational matters towards 1760.—That while it is not easy to show the *Contrat social* to be the development of a single master principle, a like task is still more difficult in respect to *Emile*;—but *Emile* being the treatment from an ideal point of view of Rousseau's experiences as a tutor,—Rousseau's personality suffices to give the book an appearance of unity.—Of the imitation of Locke in *Emile* [Cf. *De l'Education des enfants*, Paris, 1721].—The main defect of *Emile*;—and that having formed the design of writing a treatise on education,—it is a pity that the author should have started

morals with philosophic pedantry. Indeed, we do not esteem quite so highly Mme du Deffand, who was no friend of the Encyclopedists, who even ventured to jest at their expense in her correspondence, or the Maréchale de Luxembourg, who throughout kept them at a distance and who, in addition to her other delinquencies, chose to protect Rousseau. On the other hand, what an atmosphere of sympathy, not to say what a halo of respect, surrounds the figures of Mlle de Lespinasse, of passionate memory, and Mme Geoffrin, that queen among women of her rank! However, since we have not to thank them for food and lodging, since we do not owe them such a debt of gratitude as did d'Alembert and Marmontel, let us venture to say that the rôle they played—it being necessary to admit that they did play a rôle—was of disastrous effect. It was in the

by imagining a child without father or mother;—a rich child;—a child without hereditary tendencies, temperament, or character,—and on the other hand a tutor who subordinates his whole life to that of the child in question;—two suppositions that run equally counter to natural and social reality.—That apart from this reservation, the importance of which cannot be exaggerated,—there are three chief reasons for the success of *Emile*:—the high key in which the moral sentiment is pitched in the book [Cf. in particular the *Profession de foi du Vicaire Savoyard*];—its ardent spiritualism, which afforded a welcome contrast to the grovelling materialism of the Encyclopedia;—and the entire confidence it displays in the possibility of moral progress resulting from education.—Comparison in this respect between *Emile* and Helvétius' work *De l'Esprit*;—and as to certain ideas common to Helvétius and Rousseau.—*Emile*, moreover, is Rousseau's literary masterpiece;—it is less stilted than the *Nouvelle Héloïse*;—more supple and more varied than the *Contrat social*;—and though oratorical, less declamatory than the *Discours* of 1751 and 1755.—Of some of the secondary ideas in *Emile*;—the suckling of children by their mothers themselves;—the importance of physical education;—the usefulness of a manual calling; –the advantages of what have since been termed "object lessons";—and that these secondary ideas did not contribute "talent factories" they severally kept that was forged the reputation of so many literary mediocrities of the stamp of Marmontel, Morellet, Thomas, and M. Suard. They induced Europe and the world to believe that there were no men of note in France beyond the few who were to be met with at their table or in their *salon*. They are responsible for the practice of treating serious questions wittily—a manifest absurdity, since how is it possible to treat wittily such questions as poverty, or the future of science?—and trivial matters seriously. Their flatteries encouraged men of letters to vie with one another in paradox, while they were destructive of genuine originality. "To energy they objected: 'You display an exaggerated interest in persons and things';—to depth: 'You make too great a demand on our time';—to sensibility: 'You are too exclusive';—and finally to

less to the success of the book,—than the general ideas which constitute its framework,—or the persecution of which it was to be the object.

D. *Rousseau's last years.*—Seizure, condemnation, and burning of *Emile* in Paris (June 9th);—in Geneva (June 19th);—and in Holland (June 23rd).—Rousseau obliged to leave France,—and expelled from the territory of the Republic of Berne,—takes up his residence in the Val de Travers,—where he stays from 1762 to 1765.—He writes there his *Lettre à l'archevêque de Paris*, 1763;—his *Projet de constitution pour la Corse* [published for the first time in 1861];—and his *Lettres de la Montagne*, 1764.—He is the object of fresh persecution on account of this last work.—Obliged in succession to quit the Val de Travers [September, 1765];—the Ile de Saint-Pierre [October, 1765];—and Switzerland;—he spends a few days in Paris;—and decides to take up his residence in England, 1766.—His sojourn at Wootton, 1766–1767;—his quarrel with Hume, and the slight interest that attaches to all these incidents.—His stays at Fleury;—at Trye;—at Grenoble;—at Monquin;—and his return to Paris, 1770.—His relations with Dusaulx, Rulhière and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.—He gives readings of his *Confessions*;—but is obliged to stop them owing to denunciations on the part of his former friends;—and in particular of Mme d'Epinay.—

intelligence: 'You are too individual a distinction.'" Such, at least, is the judgment that has been passed on them by a woman [Cf. Mme de Staël, *De l'Allemagne*, part i., chap. xi.]. But it is now understandable that they should have been the precious auxiliaries of the Encyclopedists. They may not have had a clearer insight than had Diderot himself into his confused genius, and, above all, they may not have gauged the signification of the doctrine they elected to champion, but they made Diderot and his doctrine the fashion, and procured them the recognition of society. Thanks to them, it was considered "good form" to be a "philosopher" [Cf. Taine, *Ancien régime*, book iv.]. And, we repeat, it is natural, and even to their credit that the "philosophers" should have repaid them with gratitude. On the other hand, from our point of view the case is different, and if, for the

It is at this period that he becomes afflicted with the mania of persecution from which he suffers almost without intermission for the rest of his life.—He writes his *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, 1772;—*Dialogues de Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques*, 1772–1776;—and *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*, 1777.—Singular character of these last two works;—and novel character of the second.—Rousseau goes to reside at Ermenonville with the Marquis de Girardin;—his death, July 2, 1778.—Did Rousseau commit suicide?—the improbability of this supposition;—which has nevertheless given rise to an entire literature.

E. *Rousseau's influence*;—and that during his lifetime his notoriety was out of all proportion to the influence he exerted;—as if the passionate interest aroused by his personality;—the strangeness of his fortunes;—and the real charm he knew how to display when in the humour;—had diverted attention from, or masked the importance of his fundamental ideas.—A further reason is that the public did not get to know him completely until after the publication of his *Confessions*;—the issue of which did not begin until after his death;—while their unique character shed an unexpected light on his entire work.—Are the *Confessions* the product of a healthy intelligence?—That to justify doubts on this score it suffices to compare reasons which have been set forth, the intrinsic tendency of the encyclopedic spirit was to make for the disorganisation of literature, what grounds have we to congratulate these women on their having chosen to sound the praises of the Encyclopedia?

The complicity of the government of Louis XV., though less apparent, and in particular less loudly proclaimed than that of the *salons*, was not less real. The fact has been insufficiently insisted on, important though it is to take it into account. It was under the auspices of Chancellor d'Aguesseau, and of d'Argenson, Minister of War, that the Encyclopedia was launched. When Diderot was imprisoned at Vincennes at the entreaty of the scientist Réaumur, whose mistress he had libelled, it was the booksellers who, in their capacity of publishers of the Encyclopedia, procured his liberation in

---

them with certain portions of Montaigne's Essays;—and in the second place to consider them in connection with the *Dialogues*;—a work whose every page bears striking testimony to the mental disease of the writer;—and to compare them as well with the confessions of Restif de la Bretonne, who has rightly been called "the Rousseau of the gutter."—In any case, however, few books have produced a more considerable effect;—Rousseau's *Confessions* seeming indeed to have given his ideas the prestige of a sort of revelation.—Of Rousseau's influence on the French Revolution [Cf. the works of Maximilien Robespierre, Paris, 1840; Fichte's *Considérations sur la Révolution française*; Carlyle's *Revolution*; and Taine, *Origines*, etc., vols. i. and iii.].—Rousseau's influence in the domain of philosophy: on Kant [Cf. Diettrich, *Kant et Rousseau*, 1878; and D. Nolen, *Les Maîtres de Kant*, in the *Revue philosophique*];—and on Fichte.—His influence on Jacobi and Schleiermacher.—Rousseau's literary influence [Cf. H. Hettner, *Literaturgeschichte des XVIII^e^ Jahrhunderts*, vol. i.; Marc Monnier, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau jugé par les Genevois*; and J. Texte, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et le cosmopolitesme littéraire*];—on Goethe;—and, in this connection, a comparison between *Werther* and the *Nouvelle Héloïse* [Cf. Erich Schmidt, *Rousseau, Richardson et Goethe*];—on Schiller;—

order that he might devote himself to their enterprise. M. de Malesherbes, the official entrusted with the control of the booksellers, allowed the issue of the Encyclopedia to continue, in spite of the decree of the king's council in 1753 suspending its publication. In 1758, after the definite condemnation of the work, he showed himself more complaisant still, for "he consented to ensure the safety of Diderot's manuscripts, by preserving them in his own study" [Cf. Mme de Vandeul, *Mémoires sur la vie de son père*]. The same condemnation did not prevent d'Alembert's name remaining on the list of the "royal censors," while it was doubtless for similar reasons that, when Fréron attacked the Encyclopedists in his *Année littéraire*, it was the *Année littéraire* that was suspended and Fréron who was sent to the Bastille. Far from being injured, indeed, by the suppression of its

---

on Byron, etc.—His influence in France, and that,—as will be seen in the history of Romanticism,—its most characteristic feature is that it paved the way for the emancipation of the personality of the individual.

3. The Works.—The works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau may be divided into three principal groups, clearly determined by the corresponding periods of his life. It is of slight importance that the precise dates of publication of the works in each group are not exactly the same as the dates at which they were composed.

1734–1749.—*Narcisse*, 1734;—*Le verger des Charmettes* (in verse), 1739;—*Dissertation sur la musique moderne* and *Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la notation musicale*, 1742;—*Les Muses galantes* (opera) 1743;—*L'allée de Silvie* (in verse), 1747;—*L'Engagement téméraire* (comedy in verse), 1747.

1751–1765.—*Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, 1751;—sundry writings dealing with the refutations of this work, 1751–1752;—*Lettre sur la musique française*, 1753;—*Discours sur l'Economie politique*, 1755;—*Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité*, 1755;—*Lettre sur les spectacles*, 1758;—*La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 1760;—*Le Contrat social*, 1762;—*Emile*, 1762;—*Lettre à l'archevêque de Paris*, 1763;—*Lettres de la Montagne*, 1764;—*Lettres sur la législation de la Corse*, addressed to M. Buttafuoco, 1765.

privilege, the Encyclopedia profited by the action of the authorities, whose sole result was to make the work independent of the approval of the censor. When M. de Malesherbes resigned his post of supervisor of the booksellers, Mme de Pompadour took the Encyclopedia under her protection at the instigation of Quesnay, her doctor, and when the Jesuits were expelled in 1762 she shared the satisfaction of the philosophers. After her death in 1764 she must have had a successor in the rôle of protectress, since the last ten volumes of the Encyclopedia were freely circulated in Paris.

At the same time it must be admitted that the enemies of the Encyclopedia, owing to their blundering attacks, the weakness of their polemics, and their utter lack of talent, were largely responsible for the admiring attitude of the *salons*, and what may almost be described as the co-opera-

---

1765–1805.—*Dictionnaire de musique*, 1767;—*Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, 1772;—the *Confessions* (the six first books) and the *Rêveries d'un promeneur solitaire*, 1782;—*Confessions* (the last six books) and the *Dialogues*, 1790;—*Lettres sur la Botanique*, 1805.

To the above should be added a voluminous correspondence, only about a half of which is contained in the five or six volumes devoted to the *Correspondance* in the majority of editions;—the volume of unpublished works issued by Streckeisen-Moultou, Paris, 1861;—and numerous fragments scattered through various publications.

The Neufchâtel library possesses an important collection (Nos. 7,829 to 7,941) of Rousseau manuscripts, or manuscripts left behind by Rousseau, from which there would doubtless be a certain amount of information to be derived.

It follows from what has just been said,—and although the editions of the works are numerous, the best being Petitain's edition, 22 vols., Paris, 1819–1822; and Musset-Pathay's edition, 23 vols., Paris, 1823–1826,—that there is no edition of Rousseau that can be regarded as definite, or that is comparable with Kehl's [Decroix and Condorcet] or Beuchot's editions of Voltaire.—[Cf. for the bibliography of Rousseau, Quérard, *La France littéraire*, vol. viii., pp. 192–230].

tion of the Government in the enterprise. That the truth does not shine by its own light, and that excellent causes suffer grievously owing to their being ill defended, are unfortunately only too common occurrences. The *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, the Jansenist organ, is a sample of the efforts of the enemies of the Encyclopedia. The publication is as malevolent as possible, but also as insipid, the writers in it being capable of little else than of branding all the productions of the encyclopedic school as so much "nonsense" and "rubbish." Fréron, the editor of the *Année littéraire*, may not have been invariably wanting in wit and good sense, and still less in courage, but it would be difficult to imagine anything pettier, narrower, and more superficial than his criticism; while his bad reputation, whether justified or not,—and this is not the point here,—made it impossible that weight should be attached

II.—**Michel-Jean Sedaine** [Paris, 1719; † 1797, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*;—Ducis, *Notice sur Sedaine*, 1797, to be found in vol. iii. of the 1826 edition of Ducis' works;—Mme de Vandeul's [Diderot's daughter] Notice in vol. xvi. of Tourneux' edition of Grimm's Correspondence;—Alfred de Vigny, *De Mlle Sedaine et de la propriété littéraire*, 1841;—Jal, *Dictionnaire critique*, article SEDAINE.

2. THE DRAMATIC AUTHOR.—The legend attaching to Sedaine [Cf. Mme de Vandeul's notice].—His first literary efforts;—the *Epître à mon habit*, and the *Recueil* of 1752;—*Le Diable à quatre*, 1758.—Sedaine writes in collaboration with Philidor;—*Blaise le savetier*, 1759;—and with Monsigny:—*On ne s'avise jamais de tout*, 1761;—*Le Roi et le Fermier*, 1762;—*Rose et Colas*, 1764, etc.;—The transformation of comic opera.—He writes for the Théâtre-Français, *Le Philosophe sans le savoir*;—and that over-estimated little comedy, *La Gageure imprévue*, 1768.

That the *Philosophe sans le savoir* is the realisation of the middle-class drama as conceived by Diderot;—by reason of the nature of the plot;—the social status of the personages;—the solemnness of their conversation;—their preoccupation with morality;—and the unvaryto his utterances. Palissot was scarcely held in greater esteem. In his comedy *Les Philosophes* (1760), the utmost he could do in the way of satire was to represent Mme Geoffrin, under the name of Cydalise, as an authoress—Mme Geoffrin whose ignorance was so proverbial that it was said of her that she reverenced it "as the active and fruitful principle of her originality!" [Cf. Garat, *Mémoires sur M. Suard*, vol. i., bk. vi.]. Of another work of Palissot, *Petites lettres sur de grands philosophes*, La Bruyére might have said, as he declared of the *Mercure* of his time, that it ranks "immediately after nothing." This being the calibre of the adversaries of the Encyclopedia, their thrusts failed to take effect. The impotent lampoon of Moreau, the barrister, *Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire des cacouacs* (1757), might raise a laugh for a moment, though without its being very clear whether

ing vulgarity of the style.—On the other hand, in connection with the incident of the duel skilfully made to supervene just as a marriage is being arranged,—with the delicately drawn character of Victorine [Cf. George Sand, *Le mariage de Victorine*],—and with the sincerity of the author,—the work offers almost all the qualities which Diderot's dramas lack;—and in this way the honour belongs to Sedaine of having been the first to construct a drama on really the same lines as will be followed later by such writers as Scribe, Augier, and Dumas.

Of some of Sedaine's other works;—and that their characteristic is that they are "pleasing";—but deficient in strength and humour;—even more than in style;—and this in spite of the opinion of his contemporaries.—Moreover he doubtless owes much to the composers who wrote the scores for his works;—and in particular to Grétry;—whose music procured him his greatest success, *Richard Cœur-de-Lion*, 1874;—and his admission to the Academy.

3. THE WORKS.—Sedaine is the author of a number of comic operas, the principal of which we have mentioned;—of the *Philosophe*;—of the *Gageure* [based on the tale by Scarron which Molière turned to account in his *École des femmes*];—and of two long dramas, of a more or less historical order: *Raymond V., Comte de Toulouse*, which

the laugh was at the expense of the author or of those he was attacking. On the other hand, it was obvious that none of these criticisms, whether in a serious or a jocose vein, went to the root of the matter, or even came near to doing so. In consequence, the reputation of the Encyclopedists, who gloried as much in the inefficacy of their adversaries' efforts as in their own talent, and the fortunes of the Encyclopedia gained ground and acquired additional strength and solidity owing to the very onslaughts of their enemies.

"It is precisely at this moment," writes Garat, "that a voice which, though not young, was entirely unknown, made itself heard, not from out of the deserts and the forests, but from the very midst of these societies, academies, and philosophers, among which the many triumphs of the intelligence were giving birth to such infinite hopes . . .

has been neither played nor printed; and *Maillard ou Paris sauvé*, printed but never produced on the stage.

III.—The Last Period of Voltaire's Life [1762–1778].

1. The Sources.—[Cf. above: The First Period of Voltaire's Life.]

The Potentate of Ferney;—and that there is no exaggeration in this expression when one takes into consideration:—the very situation of Ferney [Cf. *Correspondance*, December 24, 1758]; the footing on which Voltaire stood both with the King of Prussia and the Empress of Russia; —his growing reputation;—and the sort of seal that is put on his fame by his intervention in favour of Calas [Cf. Athanase Coquerel, *Jean Calas et sa famille*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1869];—and of the Sirven family [Cf. Camille Rabaud, *Étude historique sur l'avènement de la tolérance*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1891].—He at once takes advantage of his exceptional situation to publish his *Anecdotes sur Fréron*, 1761;—his *Lettres sur la Nouvelle Héloïse*, 1761;—his *Éloge de Crébillon*, 1762;—and the *Relation du voyage de Pompignan*, 1763;—writings which are mere collections of insults directed against his various adversaries.—During the same period he is visited at Ferney by the "philosophers";—he continues to write tragedies, *Olympie*, 1762;—

and appealing in the name of truth to the human race, the voice brings an accusation against literature, the arts, the sciences and society itself" [Cf. Garat, *Mémoires sur M. Suard*, vol. i., p. 164]. The author adds—and the information is precious—"It was not, as has been stated, a general scandal that was aroused; the universal feeling was one of admiration and, in a way, of terror." This passage should be taken in connection with the following lines from the *Confessions*: "Proud, daring, and courageous, writes Rousseau, I displayed an unfailing assurance that was the more steadfast because it was unaffected, because it was rooted in my inmost being rather than expressed in my attitude. The contempt with which my profound meditation had inspired me for the morals, maxims, and prejudices of my century made me insensible to the scoffing of those who were imbued

tales, *Jeannot et Colin*, 1764;—he composes his *Philosophie de l'histoire*, 1765;—his *Dictionnaire philosophique*, 1765 [Cf. with regard to the order in which the articles in the *Dictionnaire* were written, Beuchot's edition, vol. xxvi., and Bengesco, vol. iii.];—and keeps up an immense correspondence.—His intervention in connection with the Chevalier de la Barre [Cf. Cruppi, *L'Avocat Linguet*, Paris, 1895;—and Edouard Herz, *Voltaire und die Strafrechtspflege*, Stuttgart, 1887];—and his Commentary on Beccaria's treatise on crimes and penalties, 1766.—He judges that the moment has come to make a determined onslaught on Christianity;—and any expedient is good enough for his purpose;—encouraged as he is both by the instigations of Frederick,—and by the entry into favour of Mme Du Barry, 1769.—His *Histoire du parlement* regains him the favour of the authorities.—Publication of the *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, 1770–1772.—His intervention in the Montbailly affair, 1770;—the Morangiés affair, 1772;—the Lally affair, 1773 [action for rehabilitation];—in the matter of the serfs of Saint-Claude, 1770–1777;—and the way in which the habitual indecency of his jests spoilt the effect of his efforts.—His relations with Turgot, 1776.—Voltaire's last writings.—His Commentary on the *Esprit des Lois* and his last tilt against Montesquieu.—His last series of comments on Pascal's *Pensées*;—

with them, and with my sentences I crushed their petty witticisms as I would crush an insect between my fingers" [Cf. *Confessions*, part ii., book 9, under the date 1756]. Both Rousseau and Garat are in the right. It was contempt for their "morals," their "prejudices," and their "maxims" that brought about the violent breach between Rousseau and his former friends the philosophers. Alone and unaided he struck out a new line; and it is because they will perceive what he is about, or rather because they will have an inkling of it before they really perceive it, that the Marmontels and the Morellets, the Grimms and the Diderots, d'Alembert, the group of Baron d'Holbach and that of Mme d'Epinay, that Voltaire himself after the *Lettre sur les spectacles* (1758)—which is the declaration of war of "the citizen of Geneva"—that they will all

and of the interest offered by a comparison between the last and the first series;—the two series being separated by an interval of fifty years.—The *Dialogues d'Evhémère* and the *Prix de la justice et de l'humanité*, 1777.—His efforts to obtain permission to return to Paris. —He leaves Ferney, February 5, 1778;—and arrives in Paris on the 10th of the same month.

Voltaire's philosophy;—and that without desiring to exaggerate its importance,—it has greater significance;—but above all more cohesion than is sometimes thought;—while its object only differs from that of Montesquieu in so far as the temperaments of the two writers are different.—Three main ideas are met with in his *Dictionnaire philosophique* as in his tragedies;—and again in *Candide* or the *Ingénu* no less clearly than in the *Essai sur les mœurs*;—of which the first would be correctly described as respect for the social institution;—were it not that owing to Voltaire's manner it is difficult to use the word "respect" in connection with him.—The fact remains, however, that his philosophy is a social philosophy;—and there is justification for the remark that he was "a conservative in everything except in religion."—Although he holds that men are decidedly sorry creatures [Cf. *Candide* and the *Histoire d'un bon Bramin*];—he considers that "they can be taught to act reasonably as well as foolishly";—and combine to form the most compact and implacable coalition against him.

The futile question is still occasionally argued as to whether Diderot or Rousseau was the first to "rediscover" that idea of "nature" against which the three or four generations of writers and thinkers that preceded them had fought so vigorously. Let it be conceded that the merit belongs to Diderot, and let it be conceded as well, since he himself lays claim to the honour, that he had "laboured at" the early works of Rousseau. Under these circumstances, Diderot would have done well to explain how it was that none of his own works produced the impression "of universal admiration and terror" aroused by Rousseau's two first *Discours*. Moreover, why does he not boast of having laboured at *Emile*, the *Contrat social*, and the *Lettres de la*

---

that the object of civilisation is to turn this circumstance to account [Cf. his *Remarques sur les Pensées de Pascal*],—and that society has the same object [Cf. the *A.B.C.*].—It is his views on this subject that bring him into conflict with Rousseau;—far more than the divergency of their interests;—a fact which explains the violence of their disputes;—Voltaire having always held that the possibility of men accomplishing such progress as they are capable of lies in the very conditions which, in Rousseau's eyes, are the cause of their "depravity."—This idea leads him to adopt another, in pursuance of which he violently attacks,—and unfortunately by any means he finds ready to hand,—what in his opinion is *irrational* or merely *unreasonable* in the organisation of society;—hence his attacks on "justice,"—he himself having been the victim of injustice;—his diatribes against war,—which he ascribes without hesitation or reflection to motives in every case low and interested;—hence, too, his attacks on religion, which he considers inhuman, irrational, and "good enough for the common herd" [Cf. *Dieu et les hommes*, the *Examen de Mylord Bolingbroke*, and a dozen other pamphlets].—On the other hand, as he is Voltaire,—as he is too clear-sighted, that is, not to be alive to the value of religion as a "repressive principle,"—he believes in the existence of a "rewarding and avenging God,"—a belief which *montagne*? The truth is that Rousseau, when once in possession of this idea of "nature," perceived all its consequences, including those which had escaped the too hasty and fuliginous imagination of Diderot; he made the idea his own, his very own property, and at his epoch solely his property; and vivifying it with the ardour of his grudges, his hatreds, and his pride, enriching it, so to speak, out of his own substance, and communicating to it the fire of his eloquence and of his passion, he gave it an importance and contagious properties with which it had not been endowed previously.

Be it observed that Rousseau, by his mode of contrasting nature, not as Rabelais or Montaigne had formerly done with the vices which dishonour it, but with art itself, proclaimed, at his first appearance in the arena,

implies belief in the immortality of the soul;—in Providence;—and generally in all that constitutes "natural religion";—including trust in the "God of honest folk";—a belief accompanied by the secret conviction that this God looks with special favour on the friends of enlightenment;—particularly when they write verse;—and compose tragedies.

Voltaire did not perceive that there is no such thing as "natural religion";—any more than there is such a thing as "free necessity" or "unvarying chance";—"natural religion" being a contradiction in terms;—all the truths that natural religion teaches having a source outside itself;—and being merely a lay adaptation of the teachings of some "revealed" religion.—He also did not perceive that,—if reason be capable of arriving at some of the constituent truths of religion,—it is not the highest truths that may be thus arrived at;—and still less the most efficacious;—and that a belief in a "rewarding and avenging God" being incapable of serving as a principle and still less as a motive of action,—being only capable indeed of serving as a motive for inaction,—is an insufficient base for morality;—which thus becomes purely social;—and in consequence relative, diverse, and changeable.—Furthermore, in his coarse and insulting attacks on Christianity,—he was often unfair as well as unjust;—for instance, not merely that all that had been accomplished for two hundred and fifty years past in the way of treating nature from an artistic standpoint had had its day, but also that the effort itself was based on an initial error. For more than two centuries writers had been on the wrong road! There was nothing but "error and folly in the doctrine of the wise men" of the Encyclopedia. His contemporaries were engaged in thinning the growth of prejudices, but without going to its root or even perceiving it, so that how could it be supposed that it would not put out fresh shoots from age to age? "Tell us, oh! celebrated Arouet, how many sturdy and virile beauties you have sacrificed to our false delicacy?" [Cf. *Lettre sur les spectacles*, and compare *Nouvelle Héloïse*, part ii., letters 14, 17, 21]. Admit, says Rousseau in other words, that your art has impaired

---

when he refuses to admit the superiority of Christianity over Mohammedanism or Paganism;—although, from the purely historical or human point of view, Christianity has changed the face of the world;—and intolerance and "fanaticism" existed before the advent of Christianity;—for it will not be maintained that it was their proselytising ardour that pitted the Persians against the Greeks;—or that the partisans of Marius and Sylla fell to butchering each other over a question of dogma.—What, however, he perceived less clearly still,—was that reason alone and unaided has never founded anything really durable in the social domain;—if, indeed, it cannot be said that it tends to anarchy rather than to union.—The failure of reason in this sphere had been firmly established by Bossuet and Pascal;—which is the reason why Voltaire attacked them so persistently, without always understanding them.—Possessing in an incomparable degree the gift of perceiving the superficial aspects of great questions and the external resemblance between them,—Voltaire was deficient throughout in the meditative faculty;—he never gave himself the time or prosecuted the studies required for their adequate examination;—and this is what good judges mean,—when they refuse him the title of philosopher or thinker,—and term his work "a chaos of clear ideas" [E. Faguet].

your genius by forcing you to make concessions which your nature would certainly have led you to refuse. You have given utterance, not to what you had to say, but to what you believed would please your contemporaries; and not content with wishing to please them, with a view to their satisfaction you have imitated, you have submitted to be influenced by models which were none of your choice, models which you suffered should be forced on you. You were bent on obtaining the approval of the public! Born to be yourself, unique perhaps of your kind, you have accepted the tyranny of fashion, you have made it your glory to resemble others, to resemble your entire generation. But if art in this way, far from aiding your natural gifts, has hindered their development, enslaved them, and finally perverted them, what is the remedy for this evil, what is the lesson

Nevertheless his philosophy forms a connected system;—admitting that few people are inclined to make a thorough examination of great questions;—and that this very disposition of mind may be said to constitute what is termed *Voltaireanism*.—The attitude is common enough;—and while it would be going too far to say that it is natural to the French genius;—Frenchmen have always inclined to it in virtue of a sort of intellectual Epicureanism.—Voltaire's genius made him the incarnation of this bent of mind;—and the secret of his influence lies in the fact that he secured it recognition,—thanks to the authority he wielded by reason of his intellectual gifts;—his literary renown;—and his social position.—He dealt with all the ideas of his time [Cf. Taine, *Ancien Régime*];—and he summed up all or almost all of them in "a portable form";—expressing them in terms that were sometimes coarse;—but most often witty, ingenious, and humorous;—and as a rule clear.—He perceived the more superficial affinities between them;—gave a sufficient exposition of their relations;—and connected them with each other more or less satisfactorily;—so that his chief merit lies in his having saved his readers the laborious effort that attaches necessarily to the straining of the attention.—His readers enjoyed the illusion that they understood complex problems;—and on finding themselves so intelligent they accorded him their admiration taught by your example? The answer is that we should return to nature, that we should conform ourselves to nature; and by the mere assertion of this principle—especially in view of the arguments he adduces in favour of its adoption—Rousseau overthrows at one stroke the long-standing authority of the established rules, the little that survived of the power of tradition, and the rights to which the community pretended over the sentiments of the individual.

For our sentiments are we ourselves, or rather each of us is only himself so far as he is entirely free to give expression to his sentiments, and it is this very freedom that constitutes nature: "We are all born capable of experiencing sensations. . . . As soon as we are conscious, so to speak, of our sensations, we are disposed to regard with favour or to avoid the objects which produce

and affection.—It was probably something of this sort that Goethe meant when he termed Voltaire "the greatest writer that can be imagined amongst the French";—and, in this connection, that before accepting the compliment,—which perhaps is not without a trace of envy,—it must be well weighed;—and the question asked whether at bottom it does not involve a somewhat contemptuous criticism,—of French literature and of the genius of the French race.

Voltaire's return to Paris and death.—It only remains to recall briefly the circumstances of Voltaire's last sojourn in Paris [Cf. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et la société française*, etc., vol. viii.].—Arriving in Paris on February 10, he takes up his residence at the Hôtel de Bernières;—where he is besieged at once by the court and society; — the Academicians and the actors of the Comédie Française;—the musical world and the philosophers;—the old and the new world.—Madame du Deffand writes: "People follow him in the street and raise cries recalling his intervention in favour of the Calas family";—and that there is perhaps some exaggeration in this picture; — as indeed in most of the contemporary testimony,—which takes a pleasure in contrasting the enthusiasm of society with the frigid attitude of the court [Cf. Grimm, or rather Meister and La Harpe in their *Correspondances* them. These dispositions acquire a wider range and become strengthened . . . *but they are more or less perverted by the repressive influence of our habits.* Before they undergo this perversion they constitute what I call our nature" [*Emile* i. 1]. What does this mean if not that "nature" is as much in opposition with civilisation in general as with art in particular? Rousseau indeed expressly states that such is his meaning: "Everything is good as it leaves its Maker's hands, everything degenerates in the hands of man. . . . Prejudices, authority, necessity, example, all the social institutions in which we are submerged stifle nature in us" [*Emile* i. 1]. In consequence, the aim of true education will be to rid us of the prejudices which prevent our nature developing in conformity with itself. "Men in the natural order of things being all equal, their

littéraires].—The celebrations of the 30th of March: the sitting of the Academy;—and the sixth performance of *Irène*.—The crowning of Voltaire.—He takes steps with a view to fixing his residence in Paris.—His visit to the Masonic Lodge, the *Neuf Sœurs*.—He is invested with the apron of "brother Helvétius";—which he "desires to kiss before accepting it" [Cf. Desnoiresterres, vol. viii., pp. 305–307]. —The sitting of April 29th at the Academy of Sciences.—Voltaire and Franklin.—The sitting of the French Academy of May 7th and the scheme for an Historical Dictionary.—Weariness, illness, and death of Voltaire [May 30, 1778].—Tronchin's letter relating Voltaire's last moments [Cf. Desnoiresterres, vol. viii., pp. 364–366];—and whether the construction that has been put upon it is justified.—The legends in circulation in connection with Voltaire's death;—and that it would seem that they are legends and nothing more.

3. THE WORKS.—Voltaire's works are composed of:

(1) His Poems, comprising a little of everything: an epic poem, the *Henriade*, 1723, 1728;—Odes, Epistles, Satires, Epigrams, Madrigals, and Tales;—didactic or philosophic poems, such as: the *Discours sur l'homme*, 1738, the *Poème sur la loi naturelle*, the *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*, 1756;—translations;—and the *Pucelle*.

(2) His plays, which include: tragedies, of which the most cele-

common vocation is to be men, and whoever is so brought up as to fit him to be a man cannot be ill fitted for the various vocations of men. . . . When he leaves our hands our pupil will be neither magistrate, soldier, nor priest; he will be primarily a man, and he will be as capable as no matter who else of being whatever a man may be called upon to be" [*Emile* i. 1]. Is it necessary to point out that Rousseau is thus in direct conflict with the former theory of education, according to which the chief aim of the educator should be the adaptation of man to society; with the former system of morality, whose principle was to substitute general motives of action for the individual impulse given by the instincts; and with the former system of æsthetics, which proclaimed that it was above all things imperative to regard the faculty of sensation with suspicion, it being

---

brated are *Œdipe*, 1718; *Zaïre*, 1732; *Alzire*, 1736; *Mahomet*, 1742; *Mérope*, 1743; *Sémiramis*, 1748; the *Orphelin de la Chine*, 1755; and *Tancrède*, 1760;—comedies not one of which has escaped oblivion, unless it be, for reasons that have nothing to do with literature, the *Ecossaise*, 1760;—and a few operas.

(3) His histories: *Histoire de Charles XII.*, 1731;—*Le siècle de Louis XIV.*, 1751–1752;—*Annales de l'Empire*, 1753–1754;—the *Essai sur les Mœurs*, 1756;—*Histoire de Russie*, 1763;—and his *Histoire du Parlement*, 1769.

(4) His prose tales, the principal of which are: *Zadig*, 1747;—*Micromégas*, 1752;—*Candide*, 1759;—*Jeannot et Colin*, 1764;—the *Ingénu*, 1767;—the *Homme aux quarante écus* and the *Princesse de Babylone*, 1768;—the *Oreilles du comte de Chesterfield*, 1775.

(5) His *Dictionnaire philosophique*, 1764;—and his *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie*, 1770–1772. In Kehl's and subsequent editions these two works are combined into one and printed in alphabetical order.

(6) His Commentary on Corneille, 1764.

(7) His miscellaneous works, which, like his poems, contain a little of everything: veritable works such as the *Lettres anglaises*, 1734; the *Traité de Métaphysique*, 1734; the *Traité de la Tolérance*, 1763;—and mere tracts of the length and nature of our newspaper

of all our faculties the most fluctuating and the most variable.

There remains, however, a further point: since man does not constitute the whole of nature, what are the relations between nature and man? What is man's position in nature? After borrowing an idea from Diderot, Rousseau now appropriates Buffon's main idea, and proceeds to develop its most extreme consequences. Nature is the cause of which we are the effects. We are thus absolutely dependent on nature, and in consequence we only become intelligible to ourselves in proportion as we perceive the complexity of the relations that exist between us and nature. Herein lies the secret of happiness. "Nothing is so proper as a favourable climate to make the passions which would otherwise be the torment of man contribute to his

---

articles such as his skits on Lefranc de Pompignan, *les Car*, *les Quand*, *les Si*.

These miscellanea may be divided into scientific, philosophic, historical, literary, and anti-religious writings.

(8) His Correspondence,—consisting of more than 10,000 letters, filling 20 volumes in Beuchot's and 18 in Moland's edition,—while even thus it is far from complete. New letters of Voltaire are continually being discovered. We ourselves are aware of the existence of hundreds of unpublished letters, and when they have been printed fresh ones will probably be discovered. Moreover, the wonderful thing about these letters is that scarcely one of them is wholly insignificant, a fact which distinguishes them from Rousseau's Letters, for example, and still more from Montesquieu's. We will go further still and say that, if the correspondence of some few women be excepted, or rather with the sole exception of the Letters of Mme de Sévigné, Voltaire's Correspondence stands alone in our literature, while of his entire work it is the most living portion.

IV.—The Economists.

1. The Sources.—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*;—Voltaire, *L'homme aux quarante écus*;—the Memoirs of Mme du Hausset, Marmontel, and Morellet;—Galiani's Correspondence.

felicity" [*Nouvelle Héloïse*, part i., letter 23]; and it is nature and nature only that procured Rousseau himself "some few moments of that perfect and absolute happiness, which leaves the soul with no void it feels the need of filling" [Cf. Letter to M. de Malesherbes]. Let us, then, abandon ourselves to nature, and henceforth, instead of priding ourselves on dominating it, let us yield it a wise obedience. We must not break, we must not try to break or even to loosen, the bonds between us and nature. "Let us plunge into its bosom," as a poet will shortly express himself, and entrust it with the conduct of our destiny, unhappy hitherto for no other reason than our passion for shaping it in accordance with the dictates of reason. In this way, after having emancipated the individual from the tyranny of the community, and transferred to

Garat, *Mémoires sur la vie de M. Suard*, Paris, 1820;—Louis Blanc, *Histoire de la Révolution française*, vol. i.;—Tocqueville, *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, 1856;—Mastier, *La philosophie de Turgot*, Paris, 1862;—F. Cournot, *Considérations sur la marche des idées*, etc., vol. ii., Paris, 1872;—L. de Loménie, *Les Mirabeau*, vols. i. and ii., Paris, 1879;—A. Neymarck, *Turgot et ses doctrines*, 1885;—Léon Say, *Turgot*, 1887;—Aug. Oncken's introduction to the works of Quesnay, Paris, and Frankfort, 1888.

2. THE DOCTRINE.—It is not the custom to accord the "Economists" a place in the history of French literature;—but this neglect is a mistake;—since after all they write no worse than the majority of the Encyclopedists;—since the best estimate of the book of Helvétius is that we owe to Turgot [Cf. *Correspondance inédite de Turgot et de Condorcet*, edited by M. Ch. Henry, Paris, 1882];—since one of the most interesting correspondences it is possible to read is that between the Marquis de Mirabeau and Rousseau [Cf. *J. J. Rousseau ses amis et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1865];—and since the *Ami des hommes*, 1756;—or the *Essai sur le despotisme de la Chine*, 1767–1768, are among the works which in their time made the most noise and produced the most effect, and this quite rightly.

The founder of the doctrine: François Quesnay [Mérey, 1694;

sensibility the rights of the intelligence itself, Rousseau completes his work by laying down the principle that man shall henceforth be regarded as a function of nature. There could scarcely be an idea more contrary to humanism, of which indeed it is the direct contradiction, or in consequence an idea which must deal the classic ideal a graver, a more mortal blow.

What was the attitude of contemporary opinion towards all these novelties? and what reception did it accord them? It greeted them with applause. Never, perhaps, has a literary reputation been more speedily or more universally established than that of Rousseau. Ten or a dozen years sufficed to raise him as high in public esteem as even Voltaire. Moreover, public opinion was mistaken neither in its estimate of Rousseau nor in the reasons for its estimate. In the Dijon *Discours*, in the *Discours sur*

---

† 1774, Paris];—he begins life as a surgeon;—he is appointed doctor in ordinary to the king;—and he enjoys the confidence of Mme de Pompadour [Cf. *Mémoires de Mme du Hausset*];—his scientific writings;—his first economic writings;—his articles on the farmers of the taxes and on cereals in the Encyclopedia;—his friendship with the Marquis de Mirabeau.

The *enfant terrible* of the party: Victor de Riquetti, Marquis de Mirabeau [Perthuis in Provence, 1715; † 1789, Argenteuil].—His boisterous youth, and his first campaign, 1734;—his friendship with Vauvenargues [Cf. vol. ii. of Gibert's edition of Vauvenargues];—he writes, in collaboration with Lefranc de Pompignan, the *Voyage du Languedoc*, 1740-1746;—his marriage, 1743;—his brochure on the utility of the provincial States-General, 1750.—He publishes his *Ami des hommes*, 1756, a work which is the beginning of his friendship with Quesnay.—His work on the *Théorie de l'Impôt*, 1760,—procures him the honour of imprisonment at Vincennes;—after which he is exiled to his estate at Bignon.—His return to Paris,—and his first Letter to Rousseau, 1766;—his friendship with Turgot;—and the triumph of the Economists.

The great man of the party: Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot [Paris, 1727; † 1781, Paris];—his extraction and his studies at the Sorbonne;

l'Inégalité, in the *Lettre sur les spectacles*, Rousseau's contemporaries recognised the accents of an eloquence, the secret of which, there was ground to fear, had been lost in the course of the preceding fifty years. They felt that the *Nouvelle Héloïse* was athrill with an ardour of passion of which they were fully conscious, although they themselves had ceased to be acquainted with it, that the drama and the novel of the time offered them but an inadequate and sorry parody. The women went into ecstacies over the book and the author [*Confessions*, ii. 2]; while the men, for their part, were vaguely aware that the pages of *Emile*, of the *Lettre à l'archevêque de Paris*, of the *Contrat social* were eloquent of some ill-defined menace! The public, however, does not always understand what it admires or even what it dreads; and in reality Rousseau was not understood by his contemporaries, because his

—his career as a magistrate.—He writes for the Encyclopedia [Cf. the articles, Etymology, Existence, Expansibility, Fairs and Markets, Endowments].—He is appointed Intendant at Limoges, 1761–1774; —his Ministry, 1774–1776.

From a general point of view—the side which interests us—the Economists are distinguished from the Encyclopedists by three essential characteristics:—their belief in the laws of economics, which they hold to be as "necessary" as the laws of physiology or of physics;—their opinion that these laws and a knowledge of them are of more importance to civilisation and progress than progress in the arts or in letters;—and their conviction that the only way to improve nature is to begin by submitting to it.—Other differences might be pointed out, for example:—that they are "empirics" or "utilitarians";—who consider that they affirm nothing that cannot be demonstrated by facts;—while the Encyclopedists are "theoricians" and "rationalists."—Further they have a respect for authority, which Diderot, d'Alembert, and their followers, and even Voltaire, were in general without;—a fact which explains the favour shown them down to the fall of Turgot.

3. THE WORKS.—Of Quesnay: *Essai physique sur l'économie animale*, 2nd edition, 1747;—*Maximes du gouvernement économique*

readers were people of fashion, the frequenters of the *salons* he attacks, and being people of fashion, after the passing emotion caused them by this citizen of Geneva, their attention is claimed and held by an endless variety of other objects of distraction, curiosity, and discussion.

For example, have not the Jesuits just been expelled and even suppressed—indeed a "subject of conversation," and as well a victory for philosophy! Voltaire leaped for joy at the measure, and d'Alembert regarded it as a merited chastisement for the hostile attitude the Jesuits had thought fit to adopt towards the Encyclopedia. "Their diatribes in society and at court against the Encyclopedia had stirred up against them a class of men who are more to be feared than is often thought: the men of letters"; and it is incumbent to avoid making enemies who, "enjoying the privilege of being read from

d'un royaume agricole, 1758;—*Le Droit naturel*, 1765;—*Du Commerce*, 1766;—*Le Despotisme de la Chine*, 1767, 1768.

Of the Marquis de Mirabeau: *L'Ami des hommes*, 1756;—and the *Théorie de l'Impôt*, 1760.

Of Turgot: *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses*, 1716. This is almost the only work of Turgot's, apart from his articles in the Encyclopedia, with which his contemporaries were acquainted. Moreover, all or almost all his writings which figure in his collected works (Eug. Daire's edition) were in reality mere rough draughts, which owe most of their interest to the rôle played by their author.

V.—Pierre-Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais [Paris, 1732; † 1799, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Gudin de la Brenellerie, *Histoire de Beaumarchais*, 1801–1809? [first published by M. Maurice Tourneux in 1888];—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vi., 1852;—L. de Loménie, *Beaumarchais et son temps*, Paris, 1855;—Jal, *Dictionnaire critique*, article Beaumarchais;—d'Arneth, *Beaumarchais et Sonnenfels*, Vienna, 1868;—Paul Huot, *Beaumarchais en Allemagne*, Paris, 1869;—Clément de Royer, *Les Mémoires de Beau-*

one end of Europe to the other, are in a position to wreak a signal and lasting vengeance with a stroke of the pen!" [Cf. d'Alembert, vol. ii., p. 48, edition of 1821; and Diderot, Letter to Mlle Volland, August 12, 1762]. Be it said that it is not of himself or of Diderot that he speaks in these terms, but of Voltaire. The beginning of the incident of the Jesuits preceded the burning of *Emile*, and the Calas incident occurred immediately after it. Never has public emotion been more legitimately aroused than on this latter occasion, if there be no example of a more deplorable judicial error. "From one end of Europe to the other"—the expression is justified here—the entire magistracy is affected by the scandal, and the whole system of French criminal law is put on its trial. Once more it is Voltaire who leads the campaign, and his *Traité de la tolérance* (1763) does more to popularise

marchais, Paris, 1872;—Bettelheim, *Beaumarchais, eine Biographie*, Frankfort, 1886;—E. Lintilhac, *Beaumarchais et ses Œuvres, d'après des documents inédits*, Paris, 1887;—A. Hallays, *Beaumarchais*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1897;—Henri Cordier, *Bibliographie des œuvres de Beaumarchais*, Paris, 1883.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER.—Beaumarchais' extraction, family, and early education;—he begins life as a clock-maker.—His first quarrel with Lapaute, 1753–1755.—He is appointed teacher of the harp to the daughters of Louis XV., 1759.—His duels and his success with women.—He makes the acquaintance of Paris-Duverney,—through whom he becomes mixed up in all sorts of financial affairs.—The Spanish adventure, 1764 [Cf. the fourth *Mémoire* against Goëzman; and Goethe's *Clavijo*].—His first literary efforts: *Eugénie*, 1767, and the *Essai sur le genre dramatique sérieux*.—Beaumarchais as an unsuccessful imitator of Sedaine, and a faithful disciple of Diderot.—Of the value of Beaumarchais' main argument against classic tragedy: "Of what concern to me . . . are the revolutions of Athens and Rome;"—and that it has a social as well as a literary significance.—Beaumarchais' second drama: *Les Deux amis*, 1770.

The Goëzman incident,—and the *Mémoires*, 1773–1774.—Prompt sensation they cause;—and sudden popularity of Beaumarchais.—

his name in a single day than all the rest of his work in half a century. The Parliament of Paris rejoins in 1765 by ordering his *Dictionnaire Philosophique* to be burned, but the odious legal procedure resorted to at Abbeville and the punishment inflicted on the Chevalier de la Barre again causes opinion to side with the philosophers. Already victorious over the clergy, they are now victorious over the magistracy [Cf. Félix Rocquain, *L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution*, bk. vii., Paris, 1878]. To complete their triumph it only remains for them to throw discredit on the Government, and it happens that towards 1768 the "Economists" seem to give them their opportunity. The philosophers pretend to regard Turgot and his companions as "extollers and upholders of despotic authority"; they reproach them with employing

Reasons for this success;—and that while they are in part political;—they are also in part literary;—although the humour of the *Mémoires* is sometimes in doubtful taste;—their style is always on the verge of being declamatory,—and the matters they treat are of rather a trumpery order.—The *Barbier de Séville*, 1775;—and how, while turning to account in this work a subject that might be thought worn out,—Beaumarchais produced his masterpiece;—and the masterpiece of the French comedy of the eighteenth century.—The success of the *Barbier de Séville* won definite recognition for prose comedy;—and it is from the appearance of this piece onwards that skill in the conduct of the plot;—dramatic action;—and daring and vivacious dialogue become the essential characteristics of plays of this order.—Beaumarchais' political and commercial intervention in American affairs, 1776, 1778.—The qualities of the *Barbier de Séville* are again met with in the *Mariage de Figaro*, 1783;—though this latter work contains additional characteristics,—of a kind less theatrical perhaps,—and as proper to the pamphlet as to comedy.—The political influence of the *Mariage*;—and that it would doubtless have been even greater than it was;—had not Beaumarchais, who was always occupied with business speculations as well as with literature, had the misfortune to fall foul of Mirabeau, 1786;—and to intervene "apocalyptic and pious language," with being "enemies of the Fine Arts" [Cf. Grimm, *Correspondance*, October, 1767]. Voltaire attacks them in his *Homme aux quarante écus*, which, although not one of his best skits, is nevertheless a success, its title passing into a proverb. And thus, thanks to the patriarch of Ferney, the Economists too, vanquished and discontented, are kept in check for a time.

We say "thanks to the patriarch" advisedly, for the truth is that the various incidents just referred to would scarcely belong to the history of literature, were it not for Voltaire's intervention in them, and in particular for the fact that the place he occupies in the history of his century is due to this very intervention. It is because he intervened in the question of the "nett product" and in that of "legal despotism" that he is Voltaire; and he would

(1787) in the trial of Kornmann and his wife;—on which occasion the counsel Bergasse handled him as severely as he himself had handled Goëzman twelve years previously;—for different reasons indeed,—but with an equal appearance of justice;—and amid like applause.

Beaumarchais' last years.—His opera *Tarare*, 1787.—Obscurity of his rôle during the revolution;—his drama *La Mère coupable*, 1792.—Although rich and already sixty years of age,—his passion for speculation reasserts itself.—His purchase of fire-arms [Cf. Loménie, vol. ii., p. 460];—and, in this connection, of Beaumarchais' patriotism;—his arrest;—his release and his *Mémoire à la Convention*.—He is entrusted with a mission by the Committee of Public Safety,—while simultaneously the Paris Commune declares him a suspect and an emigrant.—His stay in Hamburg;—his return to France;—his two letters on Voltaire and Jesus Christ, 1799;—and his death.

3. THE WORKS.—Beaumarchais' principal works are mentioned above, and it will suffice to indicate as the best edition of his complete works that issued by his friend Gudin, Paris, 1809, Collin [Cf. E. Fournier's edition, Paris, 1876, Laplace and Sanchez].

VI.—The End of Tragedy, 1765–1795.

1. THE SOURCES.—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*;—Laharpe,

not be Voltaire if he had not undertaken the defence of the Calas and of the Chevalier de la Barre. We are not examining here the motives of a more or less political order which prompted his intervention, and we do not desire to analyse, as it were, his outburst of generosity. We merely note that his real masterpiece was his life. If his contemporaries admired him chiefly for his extraordinary faculty of assimilation, combined with a not less extraordinary facility of execution or expression, it is certain that they admired these qualities the more, in proportion as the objects in connection with which he turned them to account were more numerous, more varied, and more foreign in appearance to his interests or any considerations of personal vanity. It is to be noted finally, that while until 1760, or thereabouts, he had been but one man of letters among—*unus ex multis*—from this

Correspondance littéraire;—Geoffroy, *Cours de littérature dramatique*;—Mgr. Lemercier, *Cours analytique de littérature générale*;—Petitot, *Répertoire du théâtre français*, vols. v. and vi.; and Supplement, vol. i.;—Laharpe's, de Belloy's, Ducis' and M. J. Chénier's Prefaces and notes to their tragedies;—Saint-Surin's Notice in his edition of Laharpe's works;—Campenon's Notice in his edition of the posthumous works of Ducis;—Etienne and Martainville, *Histoire du théâtre français pendant la Révolution*, Paris, 1881.

2. THE RIVALRY BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF TRAGEDY.—Voltaire's predominant and sovereign influence over the tragic drama of his time;—reasons of this influence;—and its consequences [Cf. the *Discours de réception de Ducis*].

Philosophic tragedy;—and its evolution in the direction of melodrama;—Laharpe's *Mélanie*, 1770;—and his *Brames*, 1783.—The dramas of Mercier [1740; † 1814];—and the tragedies of Marie-Joseph Chénier [1764; † 1811]: *Charles IX.*, 1789;—*Henri VIII.*, 1791;—*Jean Calas*, 1791;—*Fénelon*, 1793.—Comparison between the subject of *Fénelon* and that of *Mélanie*;—and that these works must not be regarded as imitations of Diderot's *Religieuse*, which was not published until 1796.—Definition of philosophic tragedy;—and that so far as it is confined "exclusively to the defence of some political, date onwards he has become the man of his century and the personage known to history. All these events, then, which might seem to have nothing to do with the history of literature, belong to it in consequence of the part he played in them. They brought into existence the real Voltaire; they acquainted Voltaire with the nature of his power, they raised him out of the ruck and put him on an equality with the "dozen men" of whom Diderot declared as late as 1762, that "without standing on tip-toe they would still surpass him by a head" [Cf. Letter to Mlle Volland, August 12, 1762]. Furthermore they invested him in the eyes of the nation with that universal, that authoritative influence which, in spite of his efforts, had hitherto been disputed or denied him; and certain essential consequences were almost at once the outcome of the unique, the predominant, the almost sovereign situation which events had procured him.

religious, or moral thesis" [Cf. Laharpe, Works, vol. ii., p. 639],—it is the very opposite of tragedy,—and of drama.

National tragedy;—and that it is again Voltaire who with his *Henriade* and his *Zaïre*,—is found to be the originator of "national tragedy," that is of tragedy based on the history of France;—and principally intended to familiarise the spectators with that history.—De Belloy's very successful pieces: *Le siège de Calais*, 1765;—*Gaston et Bayard*, 1771;—*Gabrielle de Vergy*, 1777;—and that the object of these tragedies is scarcely dramatic;—but rather didactic. [Cf. the Prefaces of de Belloy himself in Petitot's *Répertoire*, vol. v.]

Exotic tragedy;—and that in spite of what might be thought at first sight, the conception from which it proceeds is akin to that underlying "national tragedy";—if its object be to make the theatre a medium for the vulgarisation of geography and foreign history.—Lemierre's [1723; † 1793] *Guillaume Tell* and his *Veuve du Malabar*, 1766 and 1770.—De Belloy's *Pierre le Cruel*, 1773, and Laharpe's *Menzicoff*, 1775. — Laharpe's *Barmécides*, 1778. — Du Buisson's *Thamas Kouli Khan*, 1780.—Marignié's *Zoraï* or *Les Insulaires de la Nouvelle-Zélande*, 1782;—and that all these creations are inspired by Voltaire's *Alzire* or his *Orphelin de la Chine*.

During the closing years of the reign of Louis XV., if the religious question be excepted, a sort of appeasement is seen to succeed the tumult and agitation of the preceding period. The conflicting parties are not reconciled, but they agree at least to a truce. The Sorbonne may censure Marmontel's *Bélisaire*, "but neither the court nor the parliament interferes in the matter; *the author is merely recommended to keep silent*"; the printing of *Bélisaire* is proceeded with, and the work is on sale bearing the king's privilege [Cf. Marmontel's Memoirs, bk. viii.]. The encyclopedic doctrine is circumscribed by its upholders themselves until it is nothing more than the Deism of Voltaire. The Parliament condemns, indeed, Baron d'Holbach's work, *Le système de la nature* (1770), but it declines to insert in its decree the speech of the Advocate General, Séguier, while it is Voltaire himself

Græco-Roman tragedy;—and that it is astonishing that nothing of value resulted from this effort to attain to historic truth;—and to exactness of local colour.—Lemierre's *Hypermnestre*, 1758, and his *Idoménée*, 1764.—Laharpe's *Timoléon*, 1764.—Ducis' *Œdipe chez Admète*, 1778.—Laharpe's *Philoctète*, 1783, and his *Coriolan*, 1784.—N. Lemercier's *Méléagre*, 1788.—Chénier's *Caïus Gracchus*, 1792;—Legouvé's *Epicharis*, 1794.—The reason that induced these writers to give a preference to Greek subjects [Cf. below ANDRÉ CHÉNIER];—and whether this tendency should not be regarded as evidence of a formal intention to fight against the English influence;—and to return, to this end, to the most remote sources of Classicism?

Shakespearean tragedy;—and of Campenon's significant eulogy of Ducis [1733; † 1816];—in whose favour he urges "that he has never once been seen to go to the Greek tragic writers for his subjects."—Relative importance of the *rôle* of Ducis in this respect.—His "adaptations": *Hamlet*, 1769;—*Roméo et Juliette*, 1772;—*Roi Lear*, 1783;—*Macbeth*, 1784;—*Othello*, 1792;—and of Sedaine's curious remark [letter to Ducis]: "The writer to whom *Othello* only suggested *Zaïre* neglected what is essential" in Shakespeare's play.—Still it was the author of *Zaïre* who showed the way to the imitators and adapters of Shakespeare;—and to Ducis in particular;—and if with the exception who undertakes to attack and refute the book. The attitude of Voltaire is the same when *De l'homme*, a posthumous work of Helvétius, appears in 1773. Rousseau, who lives obscurely in his humble retreat in the Rue Platrière, has ceased to attract attention. "It was his wish to avoid men," writes La Harpe, "and men have forgotten him." D'Alembert is translating Tacitus, and Diderot is at work on his *Essai sur les règnes de Claude et de Néron*. Grimm, who in 1768 predicted "a revolution to be imminent and inevitable," declares in 1770 that "public tranquillity has never been more assured." When Chancellor Maupeou effects his *coup d'état* against the Parliaments in 1771, he is applauded by the men of letters, who have become the supporters of the central authority. In 1774, on the succession to the throne of Louis XVI., the reconciliation of the Encyclopedists and

of philosophic tragedy [Cf. however, Victor Hugo's Preface to his plays] ;—all the other branches just referred to are those which will be essayed before long by the Romanticists ;—the latter, in consequence, followed the initiative of Voltaire.

3. THE WORKS.—Nothing survives at the present day of the works we have just been mentioning; and still less of many other productions it would be easy to enumerate. For the curious, however, there exist excellent editions of Lemierre (selected works), Paris, 1811, F. Didot ;—of Laharpe (complete works with the exception of the *Lycée*) Paris, 1820–1821, Verdière ;—and of Ducis [complete works, 3 vols., and posthumous works, 1 vol.], Paris, 1826, Nepveu.

VII.—**André-Marie de Chénier** [Constantinople, 1762 ; † Paris, 1794].

1. THE SOURCES.—H. de Latouche's Notice in the edition of 1819 ;—Saint-Beuve, *Mathurin Regnier et André Chénier*, 1829, in his *Tableau de la poésie française au XVI^e siècle*; *Portraits littéraires*, 1839, vol. i.; *Portraits contemporains*, 1844, vol. v.; *Causeries du lundi*, 1851, vol. iv.; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. iii., 1862.—A. Michiels, *Histoire des Idées littéraires au XIX^e siècle*, 1843 ;—Becq de Fouquière's Notice in his edition of the works, 1862 ;

the Economists is consummated by the simultaneous presence in the Ministry of Malesherbes and Turgot. The two parties are now at the head of affairs and disposed to scoff at the younger generation, "which on leaving college believes itself under the obligation of teaching those in authority how to govern their States!"

A curious movement comes into existence under cover of this appeasement. The classic spirit concentrates its forces and takes the offensive, as if about to deliver a last battle before abandoning its dismantled stronghold. It essays what little strength it still possesses against that "anglomania" whose "alarming progress" it regards as an equal menace to "the gallantry of the French, the culture of their society, their taste for the toilette," and their literature. Voltaire writes: "A few Frenchmen are setting up amongst us an effigy

---

and *Documents nouveaux*, Paris, 1875;—G. L. de Chénier's Notices and Notes in his edition of the works, Paris, 1874;—Caro, *La fin du XVIII^e siècle*, vol. ii., 1880;—Anatole France, *La vie littéraire*, vol. i., 1888, and vol. ii., 1890;—J. Haraszti, *La poésie d'André Chénier*, translated from the Hungarian by the author, Paris, 1892;—Em. Faguet, *XVIII^e siècle*;—L. Bertrand, *La fin du classicisme et le retour à l'antique*, Paris, 1897.

2. THE POET;—and that although his works did not appear until after his death,—this is the place to deal with them;—since a number of his contemporaries were acquainted with them in part;—and even imitated them (Millevoye for example),—and since their essential features are characteristic of a renaissance of Classicism,—of which proof has survived in the shape of Caylus' *Histoire de l'art*,—of David's pictures;—and of Abbé Barthélemy's *Voyage du jeune Anarcharsis*.—There cannot, in consequence, be a greater error than to regard André Chénier as a "forerunner of Romanticism."—On the contrary, it is proper to consider him not merely as a Boileau or a Malherbe gifted with inspiration;—but as a Ronsard,—who should have read Voltaire, Montesquieu and Buffon;—Buffon more especially perhaps;—and more modern than the original Ronsard by two hundred and fifty years.

of the divinity of Shakespeare, just as another set of imitators have recently erected a Vauxhall in Paris, or as others have distinguished themselves by calling '*aloy aux*' 'roastbeef.' Formerly the court of Louis XIV. helped to polish that of Charles II.; nowadays, it is London that rescues us from a state of barbarism." La Harpe re-echoes his complaints in his *Correspondance littéraire.* Translations from the Greek and Latin abound, and are contrasted with versions of Shakespeare and Ossian. The appearance in 1769 of Abbé Delille's *Géorgiques* was quite an event, Voltaire declaring the work—together, it is true, with Saint-Lambert's *Saisons* and after the *Art poétique*—"the best poem by which France has been honoured." Four translations of the Iliad and the Odyssey, two in verse and two in prose, were issued between 1770 and 1789. Even archæology

Chénier's Elegies,—and that they are characteristic of their period as regards their somewhat complicated phraseology;—their dedication to a "Lycoris," a "Camille," or a "Fanny";—the impersonal character the poet is at pains to give them;—their sensuousness;—and a sort of amorous ferocity that marks them,—a ferocity that points to the influence of the *Liaisons dangereuses.*—Chénier's Elegies are the work of a greater poet than those of the Chevalier de Parny, but they are work of a kindred type [Cf. H. Potez, *l'Élégie depuis Parny jusqu'à Lamartine*, Paris, 1898];—for though doubtless more Greek and Latin in their inspiration;—they nevertheless offer the same characteristics;—when indeed they do not remind the reader of P. J. [Gentil] Bernard;—and of the Abbé Delille:

> Pourquoi vois-je languir ces vins abandonnés
> Sous le liège tenace encore emprisonnés?

The fragments of *Hermès*;—and that it is easy to trace the same characteristics in them;—and to point out others which also belong to the eighteenth century.—Full of the ideas of Buffon, André Chénier appears in this work as an enthusiastic interpreter of the ideas of his time;—and already as the poet of the "struggle for life.'

and erudition, which had been so disdainfully handled in the Preliminary Discourse of the Encyclopedia, come into fashion again. A young writer declares, in the notes he scribbles on the margin of his copy of Malherbe, that "even when we depict modern scenes and characters, we must learn how to delineate them by studying Homer, Virgil, Plutarch, Tacitus, Sophocles, and Æschylus." A little later he will write in verse: "Feast on the seductive fare offered by the mighty writers of Greece, but avoid the heavy intoxication of that spurious and boisterous Permessus, where drink the harsh singers of the nebulous North." Would Boileau himself have given different advice?

The reader will perhaps be surprised that in proof of this renaissance of the classic spirit we should cite the author of the *Barbier de Séville* and of the *Mariage de*

—Like Voltaire and Condorcet he deals with the origin of religions;—laying to their door most of the sufferings of humanity;—and accusing the "priests" of having turned them to account in their own interest. —Finally in the third Canto he develops the doctrine of "transformed sensation";—proclaims the invincible tendency of man towards "virtue and truth";—and concludes by addressing a hymn to "science" [Cf. Condorcet's *Esquisse des progrès de l'Esprit humain*].—This is the pure philosophy of the Encyclopedists;—and doubtless Chénier would have developed it otherwise than did his friend Le Brun;—but no philosophy is further removed not merely from that of the Romanticists who are about to appear on the scene;—but even from that of Rousseau.

André Chénier's *Idylles*;—and that without doubt it is not the inspiration of *Oaristys* or of the *Jeune Malade*,—that differs from that of *Hermès* or of the *Elégies*;—at least if this latter inspiration be taken as just defined.—But as André Chénier is in immediate touch with Greek literature;—and is in deep sympathy with Alexandrinism;—if not with the antiquity of Sophocles, Pindar, and Homer;—by dint of imitating his models his verse has a strength which the inconsistent, colourless verse of his rivals lacks;—but his poetry is not on this account in contradiction with the ideas of his

Figaro? It is a fact that Beaumarchais is scarcely a man of letters; he is a man of business, and a man of business whose transactions were often or even usually of no very reputable order. Few, assuredly, of his contemporaries were less versed than he in the ancients, who were quite unknown to the society he frequents. His case, however, is only the more interesting on this account, and his example the more significant. For so long as he followed in the footsteps of Diderot and Sedaine—in his *Eugénie* (1716) of which he laid the scene in England, and in the *Deux amis* (1770)—he did but poor work. However, after producing those *Mémoires*, whose spiritedness excited the jealousy of Voltaire—and the work indeed would be wholly in the classic tradition but fór its shortcomings in the matter of good taste and in particular of good manners—it occurs to him to be the third

time.—Or rather, while resembling his contemporaries in every other respect,—he is distinguished from them solely by a subtler intelligence of that antiquity they have ceased to understand,—and by the fact that he combined their admiration for their own time,—with an artistic sense which finds utterance in the proverbial line:

> Let us express new thoughts in verse such as the ancients wrote.

Moreover Chénier's doctrines are in entire conformity with the character of his work, as is proved,—by his protests against "Anglomania":—"The English poets . . . sad as their ever cloud-girt sky, swollen as the sea that washes their shores, sombre and heavy; . . ." —and still more by the fourth of his *Epîtres* addressed to Le Brun;—or again by his *Poème de l'Invention*;—the precepts in which are precisely those of Boileau;—but of a Boileau more emancipated, and in particular more cultured, and perhaps, too, more "aristocratic" than the real Boileau.—Comparison in this respect between the *Poème de l'Invention* and the *Art poétique*;—and the *Défense et Illustration de la Langue française* [Cf. in particular verses 299–390].—In consequence, Chénier must in nowise be regarded as the "first of the Romanticists," but on the contrary as the "last of the classic writers."—Had he lived, his influence would not perhaps have writer to treat the subject dealt with in the *Folies amoureuses* and the *École des femmes*: the guardian of the old comedy, duped by the eternal *ingénue*. He gives this subject a Spanish background, the background of Le Sage's stories and of Scarron's plays, and he produces the *Barbier de Séville* (1775) in reading which we are reminded of *Gil Blas*. In 1783 he repeats his performance, and the result is the *Mariage de Figaro*. And whether Figaro be he, Beaumarchias, himself, drawn from the life, with his utter absence of scruples and his fund of gaiety, or, as some regard the character, a "forerunner of the Revolution," he is first of all and above all the valet of old comedy, the last and most entertaining of the Frontins, the Crispins, and the Scapins. Might we not declare, in other words, that directly Beaumarchais followed in the footsteps or rather re-

absolutely modified the direction taken by literature;—owing to the strength of the movement in progress;—but it is certainly in Chénier that the disciples and literary imitators of Rousseau would have found their most redoubtable adversary.

3. The Works.—The works of André Chénier are composed of: (1) his poetry, forming three principal divisions: the Idylls, the Elegies, and the Poems or fragments of poems. Students of his poetry ought to consult at least four editions: H. de Latouche's edition, Paris, 1819; Becq de Fouquière's edition, Paris, 1862, Charpentier; G. de Chénier's edition, Paris, 1874, Lemerre; and the last edition issued by Becq de Fouquières, Paris, 1888, Charpentier;—(2) his prose writings, all or almost all of which have to do with politics;—and (3) of a somewhat brief but extremely important Commentary on Malherbe, first published in 1842, in the standard edition of Malherbe's works (Paris, Charpentier).

VII.—**Georges-Louis Leclerc de Buffon** [Montbard, 1707; † 1788, Paris.]

1. The Sources.—Grimm, *Correspondance littéraire*;—Hérault de Séchelles, *Voyage à Montbard*, Paris, 1785;—Vicq d'Azyr, *Discours de réception*, 1788; —Condorcet, *Éloge de M. le Comte de Buffon*,

sumed the traditions of Regnard and Molière he met with the success he had in vain sought to achieve by imitating Sedaine and Diderot? And what is more characteristic of the movement of which we are endeavouring to determine the nature? Apart from Voltaire's last pamphlets and the concluding volumes of Buffon's *Histoire naturelle,* which are "continuations," only two "novelties" destined to survive appeared between 1775 and 1785, two comedies whose inspiration is certainly "classic," whatever opinion be held with regard to their qualities or their shortcomings.

Towards the same period, tragedy, like comedy, harks back to its original sources of inspiration, though with less happy results, in this sense that it has left us nothing, I will not say comparable to the *Barbier de Séville* or the *Mariage de Figaro,* but nothing that will bear reading

to be found in vol. iii. of Condorcet's complete works;—Cuvier, *Rapport historique sur les progrès des sciences naturelles,* Paris, 1810;—Flourens, *Histoire des travaux et des idées de Buffon,* Paris, 1844; and *Des manuscrits de Buffon,* 1859.

Correspondance inédite de Buffon, edited by Henri Nadault de Buffon, Paris, 1860.

Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi,* vol. iv., 1851; vol. x., 1854; and vol. xiv., 1860;—Emile Montégut, *Souvenirs de Bourgogne,* 1874, Paris;—F. Hémon, *Éloge de Buffon,* Paris, 1878;—N. Michaut, *Éloge de Buffon,* Paris, 1878;—C. d'Haussonville, *Le salon de Mme Necker,* Paris, 1882;—Émile Faguet, *XVIII^e siècle,* Paris, 1890;—De Lanessan's introduction to his edition of Buffon's works, 1884;—Edm. Perrier, *La Philosophie zoologique avant Darwin,* Paris, 1884.

2. The Man of Science and the Philosopher.

A. *Buffon's early years.*—His birth and education.—Dijon as an intellectual centre during the first half of the eighteenth century [Cf. Th. Foisset, *Le Président de Brosses,* 1842; and Em. de Broglie, *Les Portefeuilles du Président Bouhier,* 1896].—The Angers duel,—and Buffon's friendship with the Duke of Kingston [Cf. Desnoiresterres, *Epicuriens et Lettrés au XVIII^e siècle,* 1879].—Buffon's travels, 1730–1732 [Cf. his correspondence].—His first at the present day. After having gone the round of the universe, having sought for subjects in Mexico, Peru, China, Malabar, and even in New Zealand, and having explored every epoch of the national history in quest of something new, tragedy at the finish returns to the Greeks and Romans, and again offers us plays whose heroes are Coriolanus and Virginia, Hypermnestra and Philoctetes. It is admitted that the "simplicity of the ancients is still capable of serving as a lesson to our luxury, a word that may be fitly used, says Laharpe, in connection with our tragedies, which we have made at times somewhat too ornate." The same writer opines that "our overweening delicacy, in its desire to ennoble all it touches, may cause us to overlook the charm of primitive nature"; and he concludes that while it is doubtless a mistake "to imitate the Greeks in everything,

Memoir to the Academy of Sciences;—he is appointed assistant to the mechanical section of that body;—and his translation of Hale's work on vegetable statics, 1735.—He is appointed "Intendant of the King's Garden," 1739;—he devotes himself exclusively to natural history;—and brings to bear on his studies the independent spirit and wide curiosity characteristic of the men of his time;—the qualities of his own well-balanced Burgundian temperament;—a temperament not without analogies to that of Bossuet;—his genius for assimilation;—his wealth of imagination;—and his elevated style. —The three first volumes of the *Histoire naturelle.*

Of Buffon's style;—and does it deserve the sharp criticism of which it has been the object;—or the jokes in doubtful taste that are still made at its expense;—on account of the occasional occurrence in it of rather pompous sentences,—or somewhat garish touches?—Buffon's co-workers: Daubenton, Bexon, Guéneau de Montbeillard;—and his method of correcting them [Cf. Flourens, *Manuscrits de Buffon*].—On the other hand, his frigid treatment of some of the great scenes he has described or imagined has also been reproached him [Cf. Em. Montégut, *Souvenirs de Bourgogne*];—a fact that might tempt one to say that these criticisms counterbalance or annul each other.—It is more accurate, however, to say that they still so far as the expression of the natural sentiments is concerned, there exists no purer model than that they offer us in their best works" (Cf. Laharpe, *Cours de littérature*, part II, bk. I, chap. 5). It would seem, moreover, that tragedy, in returning to its early traditions, acquires fresh vigour; for its struggle against the melodrama of such writers as Diderot and Mercier, or a little later of Guilbert de Pixerécourt, is the almost exact counterpart of the former conflict between the tragedy of Corneille and the tragi-comedy of Rotrou, Mairet, and Hardy. The men of the Revolution are about to go back a step further, for, as is well known, they will model their attitude in public life not on the Romans of Balzac or Corneille, but on the Greeks and Romans of Plutarch—or of Amyot.

In the meantime another writer, a poet, and the only author of the time possessed of artistic feeling, harke

are only apparently at variance:—since Buffon's style, being naturally noble and adapting itself without effort to the loftiest subjects, seems to fall rather below what we should expect when treating such subjects;—a circumstance that accounts for its striking us as too majestic, and superior in some sort to the dignity of its object—when it deals with less considerable matters;—and particularly in descriptive passages.—Buffon, moreover, can heighten his style when necessary;—and to say nothing of its rhythm, precision, and colour,—he has on more than one occasion attained to lyricism (Cf. the *Histoire naturelle de l'homme*);—and more than once to the level of the epopee (Cf. the *Époques de la nature*).

B. *The successive phases of Buffon's thought.*—Buffon's fondness for hypotheses;—and how this taste, in presence of the exigences of the observation of nature;—and the successive acquisitions resulting from study,—seems to have introduced some confusion into Buffon's ideas.—From 1749 to 1759 he is the sworn enemy of "classifications";—which he holds to be artificial;—and not grounded on nature;—he esteems them in consequence mere aids to the memory;—and what is more dangerous,—as tending to deprive man of his rank as king of creation (Cf. vol. I of the edition of the Imprimerie royale.

further back still to the very beginnings of classicism: we refer to André Chénier, in whom Ronsard may truthfully be said to live again. The temptation is great to dwell at length on André Chénier, but his work is posthumous, and we can only consider him here as representative of the intellectual tendencies of his contemporaries or of some of his contemporaries. At least we can say that his inspiration, like that of Ronsard, was purely Latin and Greek. Like Ronsard, too, but with a clearer consciousness of the reasons for his choice, he applied himself in particular to the imitation of the erotic Latin writers and of the poets of the Alexandrian school. Like Ronsard, he held that all beauty, all perfection was contained in the masterpieces of the ancients, and in consequence, like Ronsard, he believed all invention, all genius even, to consist in clothing his thought in their immortal forms of expression.

---

p. 4; and vol. iv., p. 433].—Hence the order he follows in arranging his matter;—passing from "domestic" animals to "wild" animals;—and from "wild" animals to "carnivorous" animals;—or from Europe to the rest of the old Continent;—and from the Old Continent to the New;—a mode of proceeding which amounts to subordinating the entire evolution of nature to the formation of man;—and the development of civilisation.—But between 1757 and 1764, while studying the animals of the New World,—and laying the foundations, in the meantime, of zoological geography,—he perceives that the animals of the New World are not the same as those of the Old;—that, although not the same, they are analogous;—and finally that they are in general smaller.—To explain these phenomena he sees no other way open to him than to have recourse to the influence of climate, food, and the rivalry between the different species;—and to attribute to nature a greater plasticity than he had done hitherto.—It is at this period that his ideas most closely resemble what will one day be the ideas of Darwin;—in spite of the fact that he always continues to regard man as a being occupying a place apart in nature [Cf. his nomenclature of monkeys].—Finally, between 1764 and 1787 further new ideas occur to him;—which he opposes to those

Let us express new thoughts in verse such as the ancients wrote.

A Pagan like Ronsard, as profoundly Pagan in his *Idylles* as the author of the *Hymnes* and of the *Sonnets à Cassandre*, he loved, he was affected by, he conceived nature in the same way as Ronsard. Sensual and voluptuous as Ronsard was, his melancholy, like that of Ronsard, scarcely differed from that of the great Epicureans. And why should it not be said that he was a completer Ronsard than even Ronsard himself, if over and above Ronsard he represents the reaction against Malherbe and the protest of the subjective against the objective school? It is for these reasons, that if it had been possible to resuscitate Classicism, the feat would doubtless have been achieved by this son of a Grecian mother. But was the resuscitation of Classicism possible?

We do not think so, and for more reasons than one,

of Rousseau [Cf. vols. vi. and vii.].—He now has a greater mastery of his subject.—New views abound in his work.—He writes the *Époques de la nature*;—and as he becomes more and more convinced of man's insignificance in nature;—of the humbleness of our position;—and of the irrevocableness of the laws to which we are subjected;—he seems to set a higher value on society;—an attitude that again brings him into agreement with the general ideas of his contemporaries;—and with that religion of humanity with which they were all of them imbued by this time.

C. *Buffon's influence.*—This is the place to examine what Buffon taught his contemporaries;—and to begin with, from a purely literary point of view, whether his *Discours sur le style*,—which is merely the speech he delivered on the occasion of his reception at the Academy,—is as important as it is sometimes held to be?—In any case there are two passages in it that are ill understood and on which a meaning almost the opposite of that intended is put: "*The style is the man*";—Buffon meant by this that since ideas belong to nobody in particular,—the expression we give them is our only means of appropriating them;—and the passage in which he advises writers to make use of none but "*the most general terms.*"—The most the first being that it had existed for a hundred and fifty years. Nothing human is eternal, and strive as it may to render the eternal aspect of its subject matter, every artistic ideal is subject to that decay which is the universal law. In the second place, if Classicism—as we have shown, or at least as we have endeavoured to show was the case—owed its definite shape as much to social as to literary considerations, it was inevitable that it should perish as the result of the exaggeration of its own principle, or in other words that it should follow the fortunes of the society of which it was the expression. It is much in the same way that the genius of the great masters of Italian painting was unable to prevent their art ending in the rhetoric of the Carracci, or, the world having changed, to hinder their Humanism being supplanted by Dutch naturalism. Finally, if French Classicism, as represented in its masterpieces, had been nothing more, so

---

general terms are in nowise vague or abstract terms, but "non-technical" terms;—and to say with Buffon that what is most personal about an author is his manner of writing,—does not for a moment convey that an author's personality is absolutely reflected in his style.—There are writers whose character did not correspond to their style;—and we have cited more than one example.

In the case of Buffon himself it was more especially his ideas that influenced his contemporaries,—or, more accurately, the consequences of his ideas;—for nobody has done more than, or as much as Buffon,—to make us feel the insignificance of our planet;—and the boundless immensity of the universe;—considerations whose outcome could not fail to be the destruction of the very foundations of humanism,—so far as they were bound up with the supposition that man is nature's masterpiece;—and that the earth is the centre of the world.—Another consequence of the diffusion of Buffon's ideas;—and a consequence almost more important,—as tending to a revolution in scientific methods,—was to bring men to regard the natural instead of the mathematical sciences as typical of science;—to substitute, that is, the results of experience and observation for those of calculation and meditation;—a change of attitude which, while giving a to speak, than the imprint left by the French genius on universal literature, it is inconceivable that it could have avoided being driven back behind its own frontiers owing to the very progress of that literature, and thus perishing as the result of its own triumph. The generally accepted ideal throughout Europe for a hundred and fifty years, Classicism could only endure so long as this Europe itself endured; but this Europe passing away, it was impossible that Classicism should not be transformed and disorganised and at last disappear along with it.

The truth is, it is necessary to keep clearly in view the fact that there was something contradictory in the dream of André Chénier. To "express new thoughts in verse such as the ancients wrote" is, as he proves in his own person, an impossible feat, for while in *Oaristys* or the *Mendiant* there are assuredly lines in the manner of the ancients, what do

---

new and "biological" trend to human curiosity brought into existence a new mode of thinking;—the effects of which have still to be exhausted [Cf. Ernest Haeckel's History of Creation].

3. THE WORKS.—The mistake has been made in all editions of Buffon, the first included [Paris, 1749–1804], of endeavouring to justify the title he himself chose for his great work, and to this end of printing along with his own work, and mixed up with it, the work due to those who continued his labours so as to form a "Complete Course of Natural History." It is of importance in consequence to point out what really belongs to Buffon in the 127 volumes of Sonnini's edition, 1798–1807;—or in the 90 volumes of the edition published from 1752 to 1805;—or in the 44 quarto volumes of the first edition. It comprises:

The *Théorie de la terre*; the *Histoire de l'homme* and the *Histoire des quadrupèdes*, 15 vols. in 4to, written in collaboration with Daubenton so far as regards the anatomical portion, 1749–1767.

The *Histoire des oiseaux*, 9 vols. in 4to, in collaboration with the Abbé Bexon and Guéneau de Montbeillard, 1770–1783.

The *Époques de la nature*, 1778.

these poems offer in the shape of "new thoughts"? In the same way, it is not for a writer who has ceased to feel and think after the fashion of Corneille or Racine to take their tragedies as his model: it is impossible to acquire the secret of their manner, while neglecting their fundamental ideas. That they attempted this impossibility was the cardinal mistake of the men who may be termed the pseudo-Classicists of the revolutionary period,—Marie-Joseph Chénier, Gabriel Legouvé, Népomucène Lemercier, and how many others besides,—writers who were not absolutely wanting either in talent or ideas, and whose rhapsodies, nevertheless, were only surpassed, as regards the mediocrity of their style and the abject poverty of their matter, by the verbose eloquence of a Robespierre or a Saint-Just—than which, however, they did less harm. And be it not said that literature "is silent" in times of civil discord. The theatres and the

The *Histoire des minéraux*, 5 vols. in 4to, in collaboration with André Thouin, 1783–1788.

And finally seven volumes of Supplements, published, the two first 1774–1775,—the third in 1776;—the fourth in 1777,—and the three last 1782–1789.—The best edition is M. de Lanessan's, Paris, 1884, Le Vasseur.

II.—**Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet** [Ribemont, 1743; † 1794, Bourg-la-Reine].

1. The Sources.—Condorcet's manuscripts preserved in the library of the French Institute;—F. Arago's biography of Condorcet preceding his edition of the works, Paris, 1847–1849;— Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. iii., 1859;—Charma, *Condorcet, sa vie et ses œuvres*, 1863;—Ch. Henry, *Correspondance inédite de Condorcet et de Turgot*, Paris, 1883;—M. Gillet, *L'utopie de Condorcet*, Paris, 1883;—F. Picavet, *Les Idéologues*, Paris, 1891; — Dr. Robinet, *Condorcet, sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris, 1895;—Guillois, *Madame de Condorcet*, Paris, 1896.

2. The Philosopher;—and that it may be that he has not as yet been impartially judged;—seeing that he is almost the only Encyclopedist,—

booksellers were as busy during the storm and stress of the Revolution as were, of course, the orators. But with an entire misapprehension of the diversity of successive periods, and of the conditions to which eloquence and literature are subject, the men of the time considered it was possible to borrow the style of generations whose ideas they had ceased to share, and held that masters, whose supremacy was no longer acknowledged in the domain of thought, might still be appealed to as guides in the art of writing. It is found in consequence that the three men—Condorcet, Buffon, and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre—who continue to exert an influence on opinion during the closing years of the century, the years of the slow agony of classicism, have a single trait in common—they have broken resolutely with the past.

It has been said of Condorcet "that he was the superior product of the civilisation of the eighteenth century," and

---

and even almost the only Girondin, proscribed though he was with the rest of the party;—who has not benefited by a sort of amnesty that is accorded the Encyclopedists on account of the persecutions they never suffered [Cf. above the articles dealing with the Encyclopedia];—and the Girondins because want of time did not allow of their showing themselves in their true light [Cf. Edmond Biré, *La légende des Girondins*].—Whether the explanation of the treatment the "Marquis de Condorcet" has met with does not lie in the facts that he was untrue to his birth?—that the amiable woman who bore his name acquitted herself ill of the task of defending and keeping up his memory [Cf. Guillois, *Madame de Condorcet*]?—and that while a talented man in some respects, he was a foolish one in others.—The truth is a greater measure of fanaticism and of credulity;—even of naïveté;—have never been combined in one individual, nor has there ever been a man who concealed in quite a natural manner less real originality behind a more considerable fund of science and intelligence.—Still, and without any reference to his scientific labours proper,—his edition of the *Pensées* and his Panegyric of Pascal, 1776, together with his great edition Voltaire,—the edition known as Kehl's edition, the promoter of which was Beaumarchais,—are among the most beyond doubt he is the embodiment of what is best and worst in the encyclopedic doctrine. He might also be termed a fanatical Fontenelle were it not for the incongruity of coupling fanaticism with the name of the author of the *Entretiens*. A disciple of Voltaire, a very intimate friend of Turgot, a member of the French Academy, and perpetual secretary of the Academy of Sciences, it will scarcely be held that his scientific labours bear witness to any great originality or erudition; while he has never been esteemed a great writer. Still, even to-day he exerts a potent influence on the lives of Frenchmen, since the organisation of the national system of education should be traced in reality to his *Mémoires sur l'instruction publique*, a work whose excellence may best be appreciated by comparing it, for example, with the writings of his friend Cabanis. Then he is the author of the famous *Esquisse d'une histoire des progrès de*

interesting evidence that exists of the state of men's minds on the eve of the French Revolution;—a fact which alone lends Condorcet a considerable "representative" value.—A further point is that his influence is still felt in France;—since it was he in reality who organised or inspired the French system of public education;—while to gauge the worth of his ideas on this matter it is sufficient to compare them with those, for example, of his friend Cabanis.—The programme of studies followed in French schools at the present day is conceived in the spirit of Condorcet's views on education.—Finally his *Esquisse d'une histoire des progrès de l'esprit humain*;—which does honour to his courage and to his strength, or rather his serenity of character;—if he wrote it, as is said, when in hourly expectation of being guillotined;—remains a work of capital importance in the history of modern thought,—European as well as French,—owing to the precision of outline, the wide diffusion, and the strong impulsion it gave the idea of Progress.

3. The Works.—Neglecting his scientific, economic, and political works, which cannot be considered as belonging to the history of literature owing to the absolute lack of any originality in their contents and of any merit in their style, there only remain for mention:

l'esprit humain, of which it may be said that if other books have expressed the idea of progress with greater eloquence, few have done so with more persuasiveness. His contemporaries were fully alive to the value of the work, and the National Convention was well aware of what it was about, when it decreed [April 2, 1795], on the recommendation of Daunou, the "sage," that the volume should be printed at the public expense and distributed "throughout the territory of the Republic." It will be admitted that if the progress of science be accepted, as it was by Condorcet, as the measure of progress in general, it is difficult not to be struck by the advance of human knowledge. The religious veneration for science still entertained at the present day was founded by Condorcet's *Esquisse*, which transmitted to posterity in portable and handy form all the mingled error and truth contained in the encyclopedic doctrine.

(1) His academical panegyrics (*Éloges*), some of which are very nteresting; (2) His *Éloge de Blaise Pascal*;—his *Vie de M. Turgot*;—and his notes to Kehl's edition of Voltaire—the majority of which are reproduced in Beuchot's edition; (3) His *Esquisse d'une histoire des progrès de l'esprit humain*; (4) His *Mémoires sur l'instruction publique*; and (5) His Correspondence.

The best, or it may be said the only, edition of Condorcet's works is that edited by Arago, Paris, 1847–1849, Firmin-Didot.

X.—**Jacques-Henri Bernardin de-Saint-Pierre** [Le Havre, 1737; † 1814, Eragny].

1. THE SOURCES.—Aimé Martin, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, preceding his edition of the works, Paris, 1818 and 1826;—Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's correspondence, edited by Aimé Martin, together with the latter's *Supplément aux Memoires de sa vie*, Paris, 1826 [In consulting this *Supplément*, as in reading the *Essai*, it must be remembered that Aimé Martin married the widow of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre];—Villemain, *Littérature française au XVIII^e^ siècle*;—Saint-Beuve, *Portraits littéraires*, vol. i.; *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, vol. i.; and

Buffon, by his *Histoire naturelle*, also aided in propagating this veneration for science. The Encyclopedists had been parsimonious in their praise of him, and not to refer to the treatment he received at the hands of Grimm, he is caricatured, and spitefully caricatured, in the portraits the vapid Marmontel has left of him in his Memoirs [Cf. Marmontel, *Mémoires*, bk. vi.]. A new generation, however, had already done him greater justice. The *Époques de la nature*, issued in 1778, raised Buffon to the rank he merited. The *Hermès* of André Chénier was inspired by the great naturalist, while allowing that the Abbé Delille merely rendered him ridiculous in his *Trois Règnes*, it is certain that such was not the intention of the author. Moreover, it was Buffon's good fortune that, having left his work incompleted, it was continued by his assistants, by Daubenton, Guéneau de Montbeillard, Lacépède and

Causeries du lundi, vol. vi.;—Arvède Barine, *Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1891;—Fernand Maury, *Étude sur la vie et les œuvres de Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, Paris, 1892.

2. The Man and the Writer.—His family and education;—his adventurous youth;—his travels in Germany, Holland, and Russia.—A favourite with women [Cf. Maury, *Essai*, etc.].—He goes to the Mauritius in the capacity of colonial engineer, 1768.—His return to France, 1771;—his quest of a wife, or rather of a dowry;—and his friendship with Jean-Jacques Rousseau.—He publishes his *Voyage à l'Ile de France*, 1773;—a work which procures him admittance to the society of Mlle de Lespinasse,—and of Mme Geoffrin;—where he makes the acquaintance of "the philosophers";—whose adversary he promptly becomes owing to incompatibility of humour;—and also because d'Alembert fails to induce Turgot to accord him a pension and a post.—He publishes the *Études de la nature*, 1784; and *Paul et Virginie*, 1787.—His rôle during the early years of the Revolution;—his appointment as Intendant of the King's Garden, 1792.—His Memoir on the "necessity of adjoining a menagerie to the Horticultural Garden."—The reorganisation of the Museum causes the

Lamarck, who were shortly to be followed by such naturalists as Cuvier and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire. He had brought a new science into existence, the science of organic life, and this fresh department of knowledge was about to be enriched, was daily being enriched, by the discussion of his bold theories as much as by his discoveries themselves. But since these discoveries and theories all tended to strip man not precisely of his rank in nature—where he continued to occupy the first place—but of the sovereignty he assigned himself in the natural world, they could not fail sooner or later to produce effects analogous to those which resulted from Newton's discoveries, making of the earth, instead of the "centre of the universe," merely one of the "small planets" of a siderial system which is itself constituted by an infinity of other planets [Cf. E. Haeckel's *History of Creation*, chap. i. and ii.]

abolition of his post.—He is appointed professor of ethics at the École Normale [Cf. as to the École Normale, Picavet, *Les idéologues*, Paris, 1891, and the *Livre du Centenaire de l'École normale*, Paris. 1895].

Importance of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's rôle in literature;—and that he is eminently representative of three things:—the first attempts to introduce the exotic element into descriptive literature;—the reaction of the champions of sentiment against the abuses of Rationalism;—and the transformation of the algebraic style into a concrete style instinct with life and colour.—His accounts of his travels:—and how they widen the horizon opened up by Rousseau in his *Nouvelle Héloïse*.—The descriptions in the *Voyage à l'Ile de France*, 1773, and those in the Abbé Delille's *Jardins*, 1782.—Opposition between the two writers' manners; and how Bernardin de Saint-Pierre supplements and completes Buffon.—Whether the principal merit of *Paul et Virginie* does not lie in the novelty of the background;—and what would remain of the rather silly child's idyll,—if it were stripped of the seduction and charm of the descriptive passages that set it off [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, vol. i., eighth and ninth lessons].

Had Bernardin de Saint-Pierre a presentiment of some of these consequences? To-day he is solely remembered by a brief novel, *Paul et Virginie,* which has caused the shedding of more tears than the story of "Iphigenia offered up in sacrifice in Aulis." This fate is inadequate to his deserts. A sincere and appreciative moralist—though indeed an egoist, a schemer, ambitious of success and a man whose gallantry has often a wheedling tone that is unctuous and unpleasant—Bernardin de Saint-Pierre is an admirable writer. The delightful and brilliant hues, or the delicate and nicely graduated tones with which he lends variety to his descriptive passages—one is tempted to say to his "palette"—in the *Études de la nature* are too generally ignored. He aimed, too, at protesting against the narrow rationalism of the Encyclopedists, and, after his fashion, at preventing his contemporaries abandoning all belief in God and still more in Provi-

The philosophy of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre;—and that it may almost be said to begin and end with the idea of finality.—His exaggerations on this head;—already in the *Études*;—but still more in the *Harmonies*;—which it is true did not appear until after his death. —The cause of these exaggerations;—and that they are the outcome at once of the author's intimate knowledge of nature,—and of his intention to counteract the philosophy of his century.—How they led Bernardin de Saint-Pierre to impeach the science of his time;—to subordinate science to morality;—and morality itself to æsthetics. —That in this and several other respects Bernardin de Saint-Pierre forms the connecting link between Chateaubriand and Rousseau; between the *Génie du christianisme* and the *Profession de foi du vicaire Savoyard*;—and between the renovation of the Christian idea and the crisis undergone by sentimentalism in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Moreover all three writers mark distinct stages in the renewal of style;—and, in this connection, that it must not be forgotten that the *Études de la nature* were written before the publication of the *Confessions* and the *Rêveries du promeneur solitaire* [Cf. *Correspondance*, I. and II.].—Suppleness, precision, and colour of Bernardin de dence. It has to be confessed that the way in which he set about this task is proof that he was not what was termed in his time a "thinking head." His use and abuse of final causes is only too notorious, while, to speak plainly, his excessive sentimentalism lands him in sheer silliness. His chief misfortune, however, was to have been preceded by Rousseau and followed by Chateaubriand. His entire work, so far as concerns the thought that finds expression in it, or attempts to find expression amid the overgrowth of verbiage, is a mere development or amplification of the *Lettre sur la Providence.* On the other hand, considered as a champion of the rights of sentiment he is merely a forerunner of, or is paving the way for, the author of the *Génie du christianisme.* Similarly, while his style is neither as sober, as vigorous, nor as eloquent as that of Rousseau, it is without the brilliancy, the beauty, and the stately

Saint-Pierre's descriptive style.—That it is the objects themselves that he describes, and not at all,—or to quite a secondary extent, —the feelings or moods the objects arouse in him.—Freshness, richness, and "technicality" of his vocabulary.—Of the nature of his picturesqueness;—and that it is more especially the result of a faithfulness of imitation;—which obtains broad effects by processes of the kind employed by the miniaturist.

Last years of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre;—and that he furnishes another good example of the writers whose character has been strangely different to their style [Cf. F. Maury, *Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*].—His lectures at the École Normale, 1795;—and his election to the Institute;—he works at his *Harmonies de la nature.*—His *Mort de Socrate* [a fragment of the *Harmonies*] and his *Mémoire sur la nature de la morale*, 1798.—His relations with Bonaparte and Chateaubriand.—His second marriage;—and the light which the circumstances under which it was contracted throw upon his character;—and how Aimé Martin, his secretary, and the second husband of his widow,—has made of him the "respectable and virtuous personage" he is popularly believed to have been.—The great edition of *Paul et Virginie*, 1806 [in 4to, Didot]; —and the measure of the style of Chateaubriand. His very life, while it has something of the adventurous character of the lives of Chateaubriand and Rousseau, lacks the psychological interest that attaches to the existence of Rousseau, without possessing the public or almost political interest offered by the career of Chateaubriand. Finally, whether it be the fault of circumstances or his own fault, it cannot be said of him that he either closed a finishing or started a commencing period in the history of literature. This honour belongs to Chateaubriand. It is with Chateaubriand that a really new period begins, and for once in history, by the greatest of hazards, it happens that the opening of the new period coincides with that of a new century.

---

preface "against the tyrants of literature and of common sense."—His last controversies and his death.

3. **The Works.**—Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's works comprise: (1) his novels: *Paul et Virginie*, 1787;—*Arcadie*, bk. i., 1788;—the *Chaumière indienne*, 1790, followed by the *Café de Surate*;—*Empsaël*, the *Prière d'Abraham*, and the fragments of the *Amazone* [posthumous, as are also the fragments of *Arcadie*, bks. ii. and iii.].

(2) The *Études de la nature*, 1784, which resumed, developed, completed and exaggerated, form the *Harmonies de la nature*, first published in 1815.

(3) Of his political works and a certain number of short writings, of which the principal are: *Les vœux d'un Solitaire*, 1790;—and the *Essai sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau* [1820].

(4) The *Voyage à l'Ile de France*, 1773, and a certain number of notes or narratives of travel [Holland, Prussia, Poland, Russia].

The best, though very imperfect, edition of the works is that of Aimé Martin in 12 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1826, Dupont, to which should be adjoined the Correspondence, also very incomplete, in 4 vols., Paris, 1826, Ladvocat.

BOOK III

MODERN TIMES

I

One of the first results of the waning of the classic ideal was necessarily to emancipate "the individual," to restore to him his natural independence, and to make of him, in the words of the ancient philosopher or sophist, "the measure of all things." The *ego*, formerly pronounced "hateful," and as such kept in subordination,

THE AUTHORS AND THEIR WORKS

First Period

From the Publication of the "Génie du Christianisme" to the First Performance of the "Burgraves"

1802–1843

I.—**François-René de Chateaubriand** [Saint-Malo, 1768; † 1848, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Marie-Joseph Chénier, *Tableau de la littérature française en 1810*;—*Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages de Chateaubriand*, vol. i. of Pourrat's edition, Paris, 1838;—Chateaubriand's Prefaces in the same edition of his works;—and the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, Biré's edition, Paris, 1898.

Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. i., 1834; *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, 1849; *Causeries du lundi*, vol. i., 1850; ii., 1850 and 1851; x., 1854; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. iii., recovered its sovereign rank, and once more found in itself its object, its adequate justification, and its final cause. Such, as we have seen, were the views of the author of the *Confessions*; and the renown he had won seemed to have proved the truth of his opinion. For the originality for which he had been admired, for which he had been feared, without its nature being very clearly discerned, what else was it, at least in the main, than his contempt for fashionable conventions, than the jealous care, the savage obstinacy with which he had avoided being contaminated by current prejudices, than his violent assertion of his personality in the face of these conventions and these prejudices?

If Rousseau, however, had been a mere impassioned

1862;—A. Vinet, *Mme de Staël et Chateaubriand*, professorial lectures delivered at Lausanne in 1844;—A. Villemain, *M. de Chateaubriand, sa vie, ses ouvrages, et son influence*, Paris, 1858;—De Marcellus, *Chateaubriand et son temps*, Paris, 1859;—L. de Loménie, *Esquisses biographiques et littèraires*, 1849, 1861, 1862;—J. Danielo, *Les conversations de M. de Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1864;—H. de Bornier, *Éloge de Chateaubriand*, 1864;—Em. Faguet, *XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1887;—De Lescure, *Chateaubriand* in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, 1892.

P. de Saman, *Les enchantemens de Prudence*, Paris, 1869;—A. France, *Lucile de Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1879;—P. de Raynal, *Les correspondants de Joubert*, Paris, 1883;—A. Bardoux, *Mme de Beaumont*, Paris, 1884; *Mme de Custine*, Paris, 1888; and *Mme de Duras*, Paris, 1898;—G. Pailhès, *Chateaubriand, sa femme et ses amis*, Paris, 1896;—René Kerviler, *Essai d'une bio-bibliographie de Chateaubriand*, Vannes, 1895.

2. The Man and the Writer.—His birth, education, and early years;—and to what a slight extent they throw light on his character,—seeing that Lesage, for example, and Duclos were of Breton extraction, as he was;—that Maupertuis and Lamennais were born, as he was, at Saint-Malo;—and that Bonald and de Maistre came, as he did, of a good family.—His sub-lieutenancy in the regiment of Navarre, 1786;—his presentation at court;—his first stay in Paris;—and his departure for America, 1791.—He returns to France, but at

advocate of the theories of individualism, a mere "self-exhibitor," so to speak, his cynicism would rather have tended to estrange a certain proportion of his admirers and in particular of his imitators. It must on no account be overlooked that when the *Confessions* saw the light in 1782, they aroused at first a general impression of disgust. "I am astounded to think that I should have veritably worshipped Rousseau," wrote Mme de Boufflers, "for it seems to me that his *Confessions* might be the work of a stable-man, or of some one of even lower rank" [*Lettre à Gustave III.*, May 1, 1782]. A few years later, after the publication of the last six books of the *Confessions*, Volney, who represents the opinion of a different circle, urged the same objection against the work in plainer and

once joins the "Emigrants," 1792;—and serves in Condé's army, 1792–1793.—His years of hardship and privation;—his residence in London;—and the *Essai sur les Révolutions*, 1797.—The death of his mother, 1798;—and his conversion.—He conceives the idea of his *Génie du christianisme*.—His return to France, 1800.—Publication of *Atala*, 1801;—and of the *Génie du christianisme*, 1802.—The second edition of this latter work and its dedication: "To the First Consul, Citizen."—Chateaubriand is appointed Secretary to the Embassy at Rome;—and French Minister in the Valais;—he resigns his post on account of the execution of the Duc d'Enghien.—He commences the *Martyrs* and goes on a journey to the East.—Publication of the *Martyrs*, 1809; and of the *Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem*, 1811.—Elected a member of the Academy, 1811.—The Emperor refuses to approve the speech he was to have made at his reception by the Academy,—a circumstance which definitely converts him into an irreconcilable enemy of Napoleon.—His pamphlet, *De Buonaparte et des Bourbons*, 1814;—and how its success forced Chateaubriand to abandon literature for politics.—His literary work is now terminated;—whatever additions he may make to its volume;—and after the disappointments caused him by the Government of the Restoration,—his rôle will be confined during twenty-five years to observing the effects of his influence;—which a poet [Th. Gautier, in his *Histoire du romantisme*] has happily summarised by saying:—that he "restored the Gothic cathedral";—"threw open to men the immenstronger terms. Writing in 1796, he deplores the fact "that the author of *Emile*, after having had so much to say on the subject of nature, should not have imitated the discretion of nature who, while exposing to view what is so designed as to flatter the senses, has hidden in our bowels and covered with a thick veil what threatened to shock our delicacy" [Cf. *Leçons d'histoire* in vol. vi. of Volney's works]. At the same time, however shameless Rousseau may have been in his boastful exposure of his shortcomings, it is nevertheless a fact that the citizen of Geneva was a moralist; and it was the moralist in him that the philosophers more particularly disliked, but that their adversaries especially esteemed, a circumstance which explains how it comes about that Rousseau, by a crown-

sity of nature from which they had been shut off";—and "invented modern melancholy."

A. *How Chateaubriand widened and renewed our feeling for nature*;—on the one hand by giving the additional charm of splendour of colouring to the still "monochrome" descriptions of Rousseau;—by the way in which he expanded into frescoes the "miniatures" of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre;—by the vivid reflection of his own ardent personality he introduced into his descriptions;—and on the other hand by the diversity of the scenery he sketched;—now borrowing his material from the still virgin nature of North and South America;—now bringing into sight the poetry of the calmer, temperate nature of his own land;—now indulging in a melancholy, a sadness, and a majesty worthy of the country round Rome.—Further he gave completer expression than any of his predecessors to the secret affinities that exist between nature and man;—to relationships and "correspondences";—which are themselves representative of a relationship still more remote;—that between nature and its Creator;—and here is perceived the bond of union in his work between the *feeling for nature* and the *religious sentiment.*

B. *Of the apologetic value of the* "*Génie du christianisme*";—and that to estimate it, it is specially necessary to consider the work in connection with the needs of its author's time.—The desideratum at the period in question was to "reinstall" the religious sentiment in its rights;—while to counteract the philosophy of Voltaire, it was ing and most characteristic singularity, is at once the man whose *Contrat social* was the gospel of Robespierre and Babeuf, and the man who is found to be the intellectual ancestor of Mme de Staël and Chateaubriand.

At the same time we are far from asserting that Mme de Staël or Chateaubriand refrained from imitating the individualism of Rousseau. It would be hard to point to more "personal" novels, to novels that is that more strongly resemble confessions, than *René*, *Delphine*, or *Corinne*. There were certainly fewer personal revelations in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, and at a later date we shall not find completer or more sincere confessions in *Adolphe* or in *Indiana*. It is her own cause that Mme de Staël pleads both in *Delphine* and in *Corinne*, while Chactas and

---

urgently necessary to define the rôle of Christianity in civilisation.—Chateaubriand accomplished this task by showing in his own way that art and literature themselves as well as morality are indebted to religion for "new beauties";—and by showing what Christianity has done in the way of awakening sentiments unknown to the ancients;—and of procuring human nature satisfactions of a profound order.—Proceeding on these lines, he established three points, which, since his time, have secured general adhesion;—the dissidents being confined to some few freemasons;—the first point is that a believer is not necessarily a fool or a knave;—the second that "Voltairianism" is contrary to historical truth;—and the third, that supposing all religions to be false, the reality of the "religious sentiment" would still subsist.

C. *Chateaubriand's influence on the development of the historical sentiment*;—and that to appreciate it, it is sufficient to compare the *Martyrs* with Voltaire's Histories;—for whatever be the measure of absolute truth offered by his Franks, his Gauls, his Romans and his Greeks;—and the point is open to discussion owing to the advance in accuracy of modern research;—they do not resemble one another;—a circumstance which distinguishes them from the Greeks and Romans of pseudo-classic tragedy.—This amounts to saying that he possessed the art of "individualising" historical epochs;—as he had individualised natural scenes;— a side of his talent to which justice is done by Augustin Thierry [Cf. below, the article AUGUSTIN

Eudore as well as René were no other than Chateaubriand himself in real life. The *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* would serve to remind us of this latter fact if we were tempted to forget it, and in the case of Mme de Staël, who has left no Memoirs, we have the evidence of Mme Necker de Saussure [Cf. her Notice in vol. i. of Mme de Staël's works]. "Her object in writing was far more to give expression to her feelings than to execute works of art"; or again: "*Corinne* represents an ideal Mme de Staël, and *Delphine*, Mme de Staël as she really was in her youth." In a word, Chateaubriand and Mme de Staël were the creators of the novel that is at once psychological and lyric, of the novel whose effusions may be said to be nothing more than the unrestrainable

THIERRY].—Of the importance of this innovation in art;—and how by becoming the principle of what Romanticism will term local colour;—it contributed to the renovation of poetry;—to the renovation of the mode of writing and conceiving history;—and even to the renovation of criticism;—since traces of the influence of Chateaubriand are to be detected in Villemain, Sainte-Beuve, and Renan.

Chateaubriand's political career;—and that it is of slight interest as regards its bearing on the history of ideas.—Chateaubriand's political writings and speeches added nothing to his glory;—while the articles he wrote for the *Journal des Débats* between 1824 and 1830 did the utmost harm to the monarchy of 1815;—and to the cause of which their author was the champion.—Of the element of self-sufficiency which he introduced into the literature of his time.—The *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*;—and that they do not differ in character from Rousseau's *Confessions*;—but that they deal in places with more important interests;—in appreciating which Chateaubriand has been guided in general solely by his personal vanity.—Whether the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* are Chateaubriand's masterpiece?—and that while no doubt they have not detracted from his renown as a writer, the rhetorician is too often manifest in them beneath the poet;—and not only the rhetorician but the actor;—while, a graver matter still, they invite doubt as to the sincerity of their author's convictions.—The last years of Chateaubriand;—the Abbaye-au-Bois and Mme Récamier's outpourings of a personality which reveals itself in giving vent to them. In spite of this, however, it must not be overlooked that it was the moralist in Rousseau who attracted the two writers, and his hold over them was due to the possibility they thought they saw of utilising his ethics as a basis on which to reconstruct all the Revolution had ruined, to the beginning or the promise of a new order of things they fancied was contained in his works. It was because she thought she had found a firm foundation for her hopes of progress in the *Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard*, that Mme de Staël, on the morrow of the Terror, wrote an entire book with a view to proving "that reason and philosophy were continually acquiring fresh vigour

circle.—Publication of the *Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, 1849;—and the controversies around the name of Chateaubriand that are the result.—Sainte-Beuve's book on Chateaubriand;—the caution with which it must be read;—and that the judgment of posterity on Chateaubriand has still to be pronounced.

3. THE WORKS.—Chateaubriand having supervised during his lifetime the issue of his Complete Works in 36 volumes, Paris, 1836–1839, Pourrat;—we might confine ourselves to giving the contents of the 36 volumes, were not the arrangement of the matter in them really too arbitrary, and chronology too little respected. The principal titles and dates that should be borne in mind are the following: *Essai sur les révolutions*, London, 1797;—*Attala*, 1801;—*Le génie du Christianisme* and *René*, 1802;—*Les Martyrs, ou le Triomphe de la religion chrétienne*, 1809;—*Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, 1811;—*De Buonaparte et des Bourbons*, 1814;—*Les Natchez*, 1826;—*Voyage en Amérique*, 1827;—*Études historiques*, 1831.

The *Congrès de Vérone*;—and the *Vie de M. Rancé*;—which are not included in Pourrat's edition, were published respectively in 1838 and 1844.

Vols. xxvi. to xxxii. of the edition in question contain the miscellaneous political writings and the speeches, vols. xxxiii. and xxxiv. the *Essai sur la littérature anglaise*, and vols. xxxv. and xxxvi. the translation of *Paradise Lost*.

amid the innumerable misfortunes of the human race." Again, if the religious sentimentalism of Chateaubriand had not been the outcome of his birth and education, he too would have found in this same *Profession de foi* the essence of his *Génie du christianisme.*

As proof that Chateaubriand and Mme de Staël were logically as well as chronologically the descendants or successors of Rousseau, the fact would suffice that at the time of the appearance of *La littérature* (1800) and the *Génie du christianisme*, the two works are indeed, to start with, pronounced to be in opposition, and Fontanes, although not as yet at the head of the University organised by Napoleon, rails somewhat bitterly at Mme de Staël on the score of her chimerical,

II. **Anne-Louise-Germaine Necker, Baroness de Staël-Holstein** [Paris, 1766; † 1817, Paris].

1. The Sources.—*Notice sur les écrits et le caractère de Mme de Staël* [by Mme Necker de Saussure] preceding the edition of the Complete Works, Paris, 1820;—O. d'Haussonville, *Le salon de Mme Necker*, Paris, 1882;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits de femmes, Mme de Staël*, 1835; *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, 1849; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. ii., 1862;—A. Michiels, *Histoire des Idées littéraires au XIX^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1843;—A. Vinet, *Mme de Staël et Chateaubriand*;—Baudrillart, *Éloge de Mme de Staël*, 1850;—G. Merlet, *Tableau de la littérature française sous le premier Empire*, Paris, 1877;—Lady Blennerhasset, *Mme de Staël et son temps*; —Em. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes au XIX^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1891; —Albert Sorel, *Madame de Staël*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1890;—G. Brandes, *Die Hauptströmungen der Literatur des 19 Jahrhunderts*, 5th edition, Leipsic, 1897.

Mme Lenormant, *Madame de Staël et la grande-duchesse Louise*, Paris, 1862;—Saint-René Taillandier, *La Comtesse d'Albany*, Paris, 1862;—Dejob, *Mme de Staël et l'Italie*, Paris, 1890.

2. The Rôle of Mme de Staël.—Mme de Staël may be shown to have had a threefold influence on the development of contemporary ideas;—and, according to her own expression, her influence was "European" or cosmopolitan,—as befitted the birth of the daughter

"indefinite perfectibility." He did not perceive that perfectibility for the author of *La littérature* means "moral perfectibility," of which she expected great things, while she expected little or nothing from the progress of science or philosophy. She does not quarrel for a moment with science and philosophy, but she regards them merely as means to an end which is the moral amelioration of humanity. There are persons, however, who are fully alive to what escaped the attention of Fontanes, and they combine to a man against Mme de Staël and Chateaubriand without troubling to draw fine distinctions between the two, whom they even place on occasion in the same category as Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. But those who adopt this attitude are found to

of the Neckers.—She rescued what was worth preserving of the spirit of the eighteenth century;—she reunited the "literatures of the North" and the "literatures of the South";—and she laid down the principle of what is to-day known as the Feminist movement or the movement in favour of Women's Rights.

A. The *Lettres sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, 1788;—and her work *La littérature*, &c., 1800.—In what respect these two books, although the Revolution intervened between their publication,—are the outcome of the same inspiration;—and are conceived in the spirit of the eighteenth century as regards the confidence they exhibit in the power of reason;—in the adequacy of natural religion;—and in the indefinite perfectibility of the human race.—Originality of the volume *La littérature*;—and the abundance of its author's "views";—which are always intelligent, often ingenious, and sometimes profound.—Theory of the distinction between the literatures of the North and the South;—and that it is a fruitful theory.

B. Her book *De l'Allemagne*;—and of the progress it indicates in the development of its author's ideas.—Her eyes opened by the objections of Fontanes and Chateaubriand to her book *la Littérature*;—enlightened by a wider experience of life;—having visited Italy and undergone its charm;—and in turn restrained or stimulated by the conversation of the visitors to Coppet;—Mme de Staël does not abandon her early ideas;—on the contrary, in a certain sense, her estimate of the literature of the North is too favourable;—conceived be precisely the former enemies of Rousseau; they are the men who are continuing the traditions of Voltaire and the Encyclopedia—the "Ideologists," in a word.

They are numerous and influential, for besides having the control of almost all the newspapers, while they are on the eve of invading the reconstituted and reorganised Academies, they lack neither merit nor talent. *Les Ruines* are but little read at the present day—unless it be in Germany, where new editions of the work are frequent—and yet Volney must be regarded as one of the founders of exegesis and one of the reformers of philology. The real significance of the celebrated book of Cabanis, *Les rapports du physique et du moral,* is that it contains the germs of the science of psychological physiology, or of psycho-

as it is in a spirit of opposition to the Empire;—and affected as it is by her tendency, as a woman, to be attracted by novelty.—But in this new work she demonstrates admirably that the "social spirit," after having been the soul of French literature, has become the cause of its disorganisation;—and that French literature, in consequence, can only be regenerated by going to new models for inspiration;—models whose originality will emancipate it from obsolete conventions;—and serve both as an example of and to promote a taste for liberty.—The next step will be the constitution by all concerned of a Western or European civilisation;—of which literature will be the common expression;—and whose characteristics will be substantially the same in Paris and Berlin, in London and Saint Petersburg.—The object of this literature will be the improvement of the condition of humanity;—a goal which brings us back to the book *La littérature*;—but an improvement achieved more especially by moral or religious means;—a stipulation that brings the writer into touch with the *Génie du christianisme*;—and thus re-establishes at the close the harmony which existed between Mme de Staël and Chateaubriand at the opening of their literary careers.

C. *Mme de Staël's novels*;—and that the two most important of them, *Delphine* and *Corinne*, are in reality a protest against woman's lot in modern societies;—as regards the obligation she is under to submit to opinion on every occasion;—the obstacles she encounters in the way of developing her "superiority" when she happens to be physiology to employ the term in use to-day. Destutt de Tracy, too, the author of the *Eléments d'idéologie*, has more than one illustrious contemporary at the present time. These writers, however, are assuredly not men of sentiment, and nothing is more foreign to them than the tendency to melancholy that characterises Mme de Staël, or than the poetry of Christianity; if indeed it ought not to be said that they are resolutely hostile to the melancholy of Mme de Staël and the fanatical opponents of the doctrines of Chateaubriand. The ideas of the authors of *La littérature* and the *Génie du christianisme* are as little to the taste of Garat, for instance, or of Ginguené, or of the other writers on the *Décade*, which although the philosophic organ of the period, accords its

exceptionally gifted;—and the price she is made to pay for this superiority.—It should be added that the eloquence of the protest is increased by the fact that,—according to the expression employed by Mme Necker de Saussure,—"if Corinne represents an ideal Mme de Staël, Delphine shows her as she really was in her youth";—and thus it is that Mme de Staël's novels pave the way for those of the author of *Indiana* and *Valentine*.

3. The Works.—The works of Mme de Staël are composed of:

(1) Her novels:—*Mirza*, *Adélaïde et Théodore*, the *Histoire de Pauline*, written about 1786 and first published, together with the curious *Essai sur les Fictions*, in 1795;—*Delphine*, 1802;—and *Corinne, ou de l'Italie*, 1807.

(2) Her critical works:—*Lettres sur les écrits et le caractère de J.-J. Rousseau*, 1788;—*De l'Influence des passions sur le bonheur des individus et des nations*, 1796;—*La littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les Institutions sociales*, 1800;—*De l'Allemagne*, 1810, which was destroyed by the Imperial police, and reprinted in London in 1813 and in Paris in 1814;—and *Réflexions sur le suicide*, 1812.

(3) Her political writings:—*Réflexions sur le procès de la Reine*, 1793;—her apology for her father: *Du caractère de M. Necker et de sa vie privée*, 1804;—the Memoirs she has entitled: *Dix années d'exil*;—and the *Considérations sur la révolution française*. These last two works were published in 1818 by her son and her son-in-law, Baron A. de Staël and the Duc V. de Broglie.

hospitality to the most slippery productions of citizen Parny. The men of science, for their part, the true men of science that is—those whose immortal discoveries have counterbalanced or compensated the sterile abundance of the literature of the Revolution and the Empire, Laplace and Monge, Berthollet and Fourcroy, Chaptal, Cuvier, Lamarck and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire,—are scarcely more favourable to the new sentimentalism. Their opinions will one day be profoundly modified, together with their interests, but for the moment, as becomes the true descendants they are of the preceding generation, their chief concern is the free exercise of their "thinking faculty," and in their eyes even the "rewarding and avenging" God of Voltaire is a mere hypothesis, in

Mme de Staël also wrote some poetry and essayed the drama.

The authentic edition of her works is that of 1820–1821, 17 volumes, Paris, Treuttel et Wurtz.

III.—Ideologists, Men of Science, and Philologists.

The rôle of the ideologists,—who were long regarded as merely "the tail end of the Encyclopedia" and treated in consequence by historians,—has recently been given its rightful importance by M. Ferraz in his *Histoire de la Philosophie pendant la Révolution* [1789–1804], Paris, 1889;—and by M. F. Picavet in his *Idéologues*, Paris, 1891. The Ideologists included Saint-Lambert, Sieyès, Garat, Tracy, and Laromiguière,—and they were frequently to be met with in the offices of the newspaper *La Décade philosophique*.—They frequently met, too, at the house of Mme Helvétius at Auteuil [Cf. Guillois, *Le salon de Mme Helvétius*, Paris, 1894; and *La Marquise de Condorcet*, Paris, 1896];—or at that of Condorcet's widow, who had become the intimate friend of the tribune Mailla-Garat.—They were the uncompromising champions of the purest Encyclopedic principles,—which they defended against Chateaubriand, Mme de Staël and the First Consul [Cf. Jules Simon, *Une académie sous le Directoire*, Paris, 1884].

Some of them had leanings towards science;—Cabanis, for example, the author of that famous book *Les Rapports du physique et du moral*, 1802;—or were even genuine men of science: Lamarck whose absence the movements of the heavenly bodies or the manufacture of beetroot sugar would go on equally well. The critics and the erudite hold similar opinions. "That the French genius needs to be regenerated by an infusion of more generous blood" is not at all the view of such men as Daunou, Marie-Joseph Chénier, or Hoffmann, of an entire generation of skilled Hellenists that included Clavier, Villoison, and Boissonnade, of Courier himself, the author of the *Lettre à M. Renouard* (1810), an artillery officer who would give the *Génie du christianisme*, *La littérature*, *Delphine*, *Attala* and *Héloïse* into the bargain for an unpublished manuscript of Longinus or an Homeric scholiast! Furthermore, they are all suspicious of, they

or Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, for instance;—and this is the place to note the prodigious development between 1789 and 1810 or 1815 of the natural sciences [Cf. Cuvier, *Rapport sur les progrès des sciences naturelles*];—the methods in use which are about to creep into criticism and literature.—The articles in the *Décade* [Cf. Picavet, *loc. cit.*].—Sainte-Beuve belonged, to begin with, to this school [Cf. *Causeries du lundi*, vol. xiii.];—and it will be seen that Auguste Comte was a product of it as well.

Another group which included Volney, Daunou, Guiguené and Fauriel;—and with which Raynouard had points in common;—give a new direction to exegesis [Cf. Volney, *Leçons d'histoire*, 1795; *Recherches sur l'histoire ancienne*, 1814]—or lend precision [Cf. Daunou] and significance [Cf. Fauriel] to literary history;—converting it from a mere subject of curiosity into what will be called later on "the science of the products of the human intelligence" [Cf. Sainte-Beuve's articles on Fauriel and Daunou in his *Portraits contemporains*, vol. v.; and Renan, *L'avenir de la science*, 1890];—while from the "philosophy of history" as understood by Voltaire,—they derive a conception of history which, though more or less open to discussion, is genuinely philosophic.—It is right to add that the consequences of their efforts do not make themselves felt at once,—and in the meantime the development of the new literature goes on, not merely unaffected by, but in opposition to their influence.

believe they have grounds to be suspicious of, the "Baroness" de Staël and the "Viscount" de Chateaubriand! They seem to be afraid that these "aristocrats" may one day contemplate reinstating the old régime;—and they are greatly mistaken in entertaining this fear; they have too little confidence in the work of the Revolution!—but who will be surprised at their apprehensions on the morrow of the Restoration, and if attention be directed no longer to the author of the *Monarchie selon la Charte*, or to that of the *Considérations sur la Révolution Française*, but to the Vicomte de Bonald, Comte Joseph de Maistre and the Abbé de Lamennais?

These men, of a surety, are as much "politicians" as writers, and if their earlier works,—which coincide with

IV.—**Louis-Gabriel-Ambroise de Bonald** [Milhau, 1754; † 1840, Paris].

1. The Sources.—H de B [onald], *Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. le vicomte de Bonald*, Paris, 1841;—Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Les Prophètes du passé*, 1851;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. iv., 1851;—A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature sous la Restauration*, Paris, 1853;—Em. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1891;—Henry Michel, *L'idée de l'État*, Paris, 1895.

2. The Theorist of Authority.—Two of his sayings are inseparably associated with his name:—"man is an intelligence served by organs";—and "literature is the expression of society."—He is the author, too, as is well known, of a bold paradox concerning the origin of language;—and of a remarkable essay on the subject of divorce.—Above everything else, however, he is the "theorist of authority";—and the man who,—combatting the author of the *Esprit des Lois*;—or that of the *Contrat social*,—has done more than anybody else to establish that society is the work neither of men, nor of nature;—but of God Himself.—Less eloquent than Jean-Jacques Rousseau and less ingenious than Montesquieu;—he has yet contrived to find, with a view to varying his enunciation of this his unique or principal idea,—forms of expressions which are not only varied;—but often of the utmost brilliancy and precision.—There are thinkers who "write" and others who "speak": Bonald "formulates";—and for all these

the issue of *L'Allemagne* or are even anterior to the *Génie du christianisme*—attracted but little notice, their talent, nurtured in solitude and ripened in obscurity, now shines forth with all the more brilliancy. All three of them enter the arena at the same moment; and it will be seen, it ought to be seen, if their efforts be regarded attentively, that it is against individualism that all three of them more especially direct their attacks, though they are not acting in concert, and are even as yet unacquainted with one another. Their contemporaries do not realise the situation at once, and public opinion insists on regarding the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (1817), Bonald's *Recherches philosophiques* (1818), his *Pape* (1819), his *Soirées de Saint-*

reasons, having been the metaphysician of the religious revival,—he deserves more attention than is often given him in histories of literature.

3. THE WORKS.—Bonald's chief works are: his *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la société civile*, 1796;—his *Essai analytique sur les lois de l'ordre social*, 1800;—his *Divorce considéré relativement à l'état domestique et à l'état de société*, 1801;—his *Législation primitive*, 1802;—his *Recherches philosophiques sur les premiers objets de nos connaissances morales*, 1818;—two volumes (1819) of articles that appeared in the *Mercure de France* from 1801 to 1810;—a few speeches and various short political or religious writings.

The best editions of Bonald's works are Le Clère's edition, Paris, 1817, 1819, 1843;—and Nigne's edition, Paris, 1864.

V.—**Joseph Marie de Maistre** [Chambéry, 1753; † 1821, Turin].

1. THE SOURCES.—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, iii. chap. 14, 1837–1839; *Portraits littéraires*, ii., 1843; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. iv., 1851, vol. xv., 1860;—Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Les prophètes du passé*, 1851;—Edmond Scherer, *Mélanges de critique religieuse*, Paris, 1853;—L. Binaut, *Joseph de Maistre* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December, 1858, and February, 1861;—A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature française pendant la Restauration*, Paris, 1853;—Albert

Pétersbourg (1821), and Lamennais' second volume merely as the most furious onslaught of which the philosophy of the eighteenth century has as yet been the object. After having previously attempted to destroy the authority of Montesquieu, Bonald—the most systematic, and in appearance, but in appearance only, the least impassioned of the three—now measures himself with Condorcet and Condillac. Joseph de Maistre, on his side, has taken in hand Bacon and Voltaire, much as Voltaire formerly tried to account for Pascal and Bossuet. His choice of Voltaire as the object of his attacks is the explanation of more than one analogy that may be pointed out between his manner and that of Bossuet. He has fought his way, so to

Blanc, *Mémoires et correspondance diplomatique de M. de Maistre*, Paris, 1858–1861;—G. Merlet, *Tableau de la littérature française sous le premier Empire*, Paris, 1877;—Em. Faguet, *Politiques et moralistes au XIX^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1891;—F. Descotes, *Joseph de Maistre avant la Révolution*, Paris, 1893; and *Joseph de Maistre pendant la Révolution*, Paris, 1895;—M. de Lescure, *Le comte Joseph de Maistre*, Paris, 1893;—G. Cogordan, *Joseph de Maistre* in the "Grands Écrivains français" series, Paris, 1894.

2. **The Man and the Writer.**—His birth, youth, and education [Cf. Descostes, *loc. cit.*];—his early writings: *Éloge historique de Victor-Amédée III.*, 1775; and *Adresse à la Convention nationale*, 1794.—His stay at Lausanne.—*Cinq Paradoxes à la Marquise de M****, 1795 [published in 1851];—and of the importance of a study of this work with a view to defining J. de Maistre's talent;—since the book is proof that none of his contemporaries had a greater taste for paradox;—or greater leanings towards preciosity.—*Les Considérations sur la France*, 1796.—The King of Sardinia appoints him his Minister at Saint Petersburg, 1802;—where he resides until 1817;—and composes his principal works: the *Essai sur le principe générateur des constitutions politiques*, 1810;—the *Traité de Plutarque sur les délais de la justice divine* (translation), 1815;—his book *Du Pape*, 1819;—his *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*;—and his *Essai sur la philosophie de Bacon*.

Of the general inspiration of J. de Maistre's writings;—and that it speak, through Voltaire to Bossuet, and identifying himself as Bossuet had done with the idea of Providence, of which he might be termed the lay apostle, the grandeur of his doctrine is reflected at times in the character of his style. Lamennais, on the other hand, the most impetuous, violent, and gloomy of the three, singles out Rousseau,—the Rousseau of the *Discours sur l'inégalité* and of the *Contrat social*, with whom he will one day fall into line! The public, be it repeated, does not always understand them, does not clearly perceive whither they are bound, does not gauge the significance of their principles. They themselves have no inkling of the amalgamation that will shortly be made by certain thinkers between their ideas and those now coming into

is in accord with that of Bonald's writings.—Both propose to reascend the stream of thought;—to effect the overthrow of the philosophy of the eighteenth century;—and to re-establish the authority of religion on its ruins.—De Maistre's superiority over Bonald lies in his having been mixed up to a certain extent in affairs of State;—and more especially in his having possessed an admirable gift for writing;—a gift enhanced by his aristocratic superciliousness;—and his indefatigable "combativity."

The "theologian of Providence";—and how all de Maistre's works hinge upon his desire to prove that the world is governed by God.—The *Considérations sur la France*;—and that, guided by the idea of Providence, nobody has been more alive than de Maistre to the "apocalyptic" character of the French Revolution.—His admiration for France;—and how it shows itself even in his invectives.—His books on the Gallican Church and on the Pope;—and that their object is to show the injury France has done itself;—every time it has become estranged from the Papacy;—considered as the instrument of Providence on earth;—and the centre that cannot be departed from without error.—The *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*;—how characteristic is the sub-title of the book: "Conversations on the temporal government of Providence";—and of the connection between the *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg* and the *Examen de la philosophie de Bacon*;—if what de Maistre attacked in particular in Voltaire was the philosophy of the *Essai sur les Mœurs*;—and in existence of Saint-Simon and his school. Still, they have a following, and are more successful in their onslaught on the Encyclopedists, the Ideologists, and the Revolution than was Mme de Staël with all her intelligence or Chateaubriand with all his genius; though they are more imbued than they believe with the spirit of the revolution, a fact that makes them witnesses to its "satanic" or apocalyptic character—to use the expression of Joseph de Maistre.

It cannot be doubted that the *Méditations*, which appear in 1820, and the first *Odes*, which are dated 1822, are due in a certain measure to their inspiration. Bonald and Lamennais, both of them frequenters of the aristocratic *salons* of Paris, are among the privileged few to

the *Essai sur les Mœurs* the Baconian conception which, by excluding the consideration of final causes,—excludes all action of God Himself on the world.

Joseph de Maistre's style;—and that in certain respects it is a kindred style to that of Bossuet;—which may be explained by the fact that, among all the truths of religion, they both of them concerned themselves more especially with the idea of Providence.—A further resemblance between Bossuet and de Maistre lies in the fact that the essence of their character,—which was gentleness,—differs from the character of their style;—in the same way, and so to speak to the same extent.—As, however, they are separated from each other by a century;—and that the century is that of the Encyclopedia;—de Maistre has an insight into matters of which Bossuet was necessarily ignorant;—while he possesses faults Bossuet was without.

De Maistre's insulting violence in controversy;—and his tendency to paradox.—His defence of capital punishment [*Soirées*, 1st conversation];—of war [Ibid., 7th conversation];—of the Inquisition [*Lettres à un gentilhomme russe*].—Whether he would not have done his cause greater service had he displayed greater moderation?—and that in any case, had he done so, more credit would be accorded him;—if not for certain strange theories with which his writings are strewn;—and certain more than hazardous predictions [Cf. *Considérations*, ch. iv.];—at any rate for a number of fruitful and profound ideas;—to which he gave his imprint;—if indeed whom the *Méditations* are first communicated [Cf. *Correspondance de Lamartine*, April 13, 1819]. Lamartine writes to de Maistre (March 17, 1820): "M. de Bonald and you, Monsieur le Comte . . . have founded an imperishable school of lofty philosophy and Christian politics . . . it will bear fruit, of a kind that may be judged in advance." To his contact with or to the conversations of de Maistre, Lamennais, and Bonald, he owed, perhaps, that vigour and decision which weaned him for a moment from the vagueness in which he aspired to lose himself; and it is possible that in the absence of their influence the *Méditations* would have been merely "pure as air, sad as death, and soft as velvet" [Cf. his letter of April 13, 1819]. Again,

it ought not to be said that he was the first to promulgate them.

3. THE WORKS.—Joseph de Maistre's works include: his *Considérations sur la France*, 1796, a work it is of extreme interest to compare with the writings of Burke and Fichte;—the *Essai sur le principe générateur des constitutions politiques*, 1810–1814;—his book *Du Pape*, 1819;—the *Église gallicane*, 1891 [posthumous];—the *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg*, 1821;—and the *Examen de la philosophie de Bacon*, first issued in 1836.

Two volumes of his Letters and Unpublished Short Writings were issued in 1851 [Lyons, Vitte et Pérussel] by his son Comte Rudolphe de Maistre;—while M. Albert Blanc edited in 1858 his Political Reminiscences and in 1861 his Diplomatic Correspondence [1811–1817], Paris, Michel Levy.

There is an edition of his complete works in 14 volumes, Lyons, Vitte et Pérussel, 1884–1886. The last six volumes contain the two volumes issued in 1851, M. Albert Blanc's three volumes, and some two hundred unpublished letters.

VI.—**Paul-Louis Courier** [Paris, 1772; † 1825, Veretz, Indre-et-Loire].

1. THE SOURCES.—Armand Carrel, *Essai sur la vie et les écrits de P-L. Courier*, preceding the edition of the Works, Paris, 1834 [the Notice is dated 1829];—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vi.,

there are the familiar opening lines of the first preface to the *Odes*: "A dual intention underlies the issue of this book, a literary intention and a political intention, but in the mind of the author, the latter is the consequence of the former, *for poetry is only to be detected in the history of mankind when it is judged from the pinnacle of monarchical ideas and religious beliefs*." Is not this the place to recall the fact that before the publication of the *Odes*, Victor Hugo was on terms of close intimacy with Lamennais? [Cf. *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*, ii. 38]. Such pieces as *La Vendée, Quiberon, Les Vierges de Verdun* and *Buonaparte*, did not belie the declarations of the preface; and the author, if we are to believe Stendhal, becomes the favourite poet of the "Ultras," a destiny he

1852;—A. Nettement, *Littérature française sous la Restauration*, Paris, 1853.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER;—and that he deserves to be remembered if only for the originality of his figure;—while in the army, he did little else but perpetually desert his post;—in his public life he affected to be a "peasant," while engaged in translating Greek authors into the French of Amyot;—and in his best writings he combines the most delicate sense of style with a rare rudeness of thought.—What were his reasons for siding with the Liberal opposition under the Restoration;—and whether the principal of them was not his failure to secure admission to the Académie des Inscriptions, 1818?—In any case, it is from this moment onwards that he becomes irreconcilable; and that he issues his bitterest pamphlets;—though his views did not prevent his being in private life the most exacting of landlords;—the most pitiless of masters;—and the harshest of creditors;—and that a knowledge of this side of his character makes it possible not to attribute his murder to the "bigots";—as is still done in some histories [Cf. Paul Albert, *Littérature française au XIX^{e} siècle*, vol. ii.].

3. THE WORKS.—Paul-Louis Courier's works comprise:—his imitations or translations of the ancients, among which may be mentioned his translation of the Pastorals of Longinus, of some fragments of Herodotus, and of Xenophon's short work on the leading of cavalry. The choice of this last work is pure affectation, while his translation of "Daphnis and Chloe" is extremely heavy and pedantic.—(2) His

deserved, seeing that neither Lamennais, Bonald, nor de Maistre had denounced more energetically "the saturnalia of atheism and anarchy" or treated with loftier contempt the "sophistical and licentious writings of the Voltaires, the Diderots, and the Helvétius."

The literary effect of the *Méditations* and the *Odes* on a generation whose favourite poets were Andrieux, Népomucène Lemercier, Casimir Delavigne, and Pierre-Jean de Béranger may be imagined. While Béranger, for example, was laboriously rhyming such songs as *La bonne vieille* or *Le Dieu des bonnes gens*,—masterpieces it may be, but masterpieces in what would be the lowest branch of writing if the vaudeville did not exist,—French poetry

literary pamphlets: *Lettre à M. Renouard*, 1810; and the *Lettre à MM. de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1819;—and his political pamphlets: *Pétition aux deux Chambres*, 1816;—*Lettres au Rédacteur du "Censeur,"* 1819–1820;—*Simple Discours* (written in connection with the subscription for the acquisition of Chambord), 1821;—*Procès de Paul-Louis Courier*, 1821;—*Pétition pour des Villageois qu'on empêche de danser*, 1822;—and the *Pamphlet des pamphlets*, 1824.—(3) Diverse fragments, the most interesting of which is the *Conversation chez la duchesse d'Albany* (composed in 1812);—and (4) a volume of Letters, often reprinted under the title *Lettres de France et d'Italie* (1797–1812).

The best edition of Paul-Louis Courier's works is that in four volumes, Paris, 1834, Paulin and Perrotin.

VII.—**Pierre-Jean de Béranger** [Paris, 1780; † 1857, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. i., 1832, 1833; *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ii., 1850; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. i., 1861.

Béranger, *Ma Biographie*; also his Correspondence edited by M. Paul Boiteau in 1860.

Gustave Planche, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June, 1850;—Emile Montégut, *Nos morts contemporains*, 1857 and 1858;—Savinien Lapointe (the cobbler poet) *Mémoires sur Béranger*, 1857;—Ernest Renan, *La Philosophie de Béranger*, in the *Journal des Débats*, December 17, 1859;—Paul Boiteau, *Vie de Béranger*, Paris, 1861;—

in the *Méditations* was reaching heights it had never perhaps attained to, and in the hands of the poet of the *Odes* the "bronze lyre" was yielding notes such as had not been heard since the time of Ronsard. That the scale of "values" had changed could only be doubted by a few belated Voltairians. What till quite lately had been taken to be poetry was now seen to be a mere caricature or spurious imitation of the genuine article. Was there any comparison between the lofty design and vigorous colouring of Hugo's *Buonaparte*, or the voluptuous melancholy of the *Lac*, and the prosaic declamation of a *Messénienne* on "the need of union after the departure of the foreigners"? The pseudo-lyricism of the

N. Peyrat, *Béranger et Lamennais*, 1861;—Arthur Arnould, *Béranger, ses amis et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1864;—Jules Janin, *Béranger et son temps*, Paris, 1866;—Brivois, *Bibliographie de l'œuvre de Béranger*, Paris, 1876;—Legouvé's Notice preceding the *Béranger des Écoles*, 1894.

2. THE SONGWRITER;—and, in this connection, of the song in France prior to Béranger.—Panard [Cf. Marmontel's Memoirs];—and Desaugiers [Cf. *Chansons et Poésies diverses de Désaugiers*, Paris, 1827, Ladvocat].—The heartrending character of their gaiety; and the vulgarity of sentiment displayed by their songs.—But if it is desired to trace Béranger's "ancestors,"—it is necessary to go back to the *Chansonnier Maurepas*;—and his work is then found to be the result of a combination of the political song:—the erotic song;—and the "Bacchic" song;—but, on the other hand, there is nothing whatever of the "popular" vein in his work.—Of a serious error that is still made in this connection;—and that there is nothing in the entire work of Béranger,—which recalls either the customary melancholy;—or the habitual frankness;—or the naïve generosity of the popular mind;—his songs, on the contrary, bring the expression of what is most "bourgeois" in the French temperament.

Of another error made in connection with Béranger;—and consisting in representing him as a "simple, easy-going fellow" of the stamp of La Fontaine;—who himself was nothing of the kind [Cf. above article LA FONTAINE];—the truth being that he could hardly have displayed more unfairness, perfidy, and cunning than he did in classicists, of a Chênedolle, a Fontanes, a Lebrun-Pindare, even of Jean-Baptiste Rousseau himself ceased to exist in presence of this revelation of a new poetry. For a few years to come, efforts will be made, solely for political reasons, to bolster up the doomed traditions, but their supporters will be restricted at last to readers of the *Constitutionnel*, to a few aged Academicans, and to the most narrow-minded and retrograde element in the so-called "liberal" bourgeoisie.

There were other symptoms that pointed to a revolution in literature, and first among them was a growing and, while not a new, a henceforth reasoned enthusiasm for foreign literatures. This disposition was neither the

---

his conflict with the Government of the Restoration [Cf. *Le Fils du Pape*, *l'Enfant de bonne Maison*, *les Révérends pères* and *le Vieux caporal*].—It would be impossible to flatter more skilfully passions, which Béranger does not seem to have shared himself;—as it would be impossible to turn to more ingenious account, with a view to sowing suspicion and hatred, a more shallow [Cf. *La Nature*, *le Dieu des bonnes gens*];—or more ignoble philosophy [Cf. *les Filles*, *les Deux Sœurs*, etc.];—or a more indecent suggestiveness [Cf. *le Vieux célibataire*, *les Cinq étages*, etc.].—There is no need to go further afield for the reasons of Béranger's popularity;—reasons moreover which are its justification;—if this taste for suggestiveness;—this refusal to think;—and this spirit of opposition for the sake of opposition;—are unfortunately among the most assured characteristics that are included in the expression "gauloiserie."

Still, it cannot be contested that there is infinite art in certain of Béranger's songs [Cf. *la Bonne vieille*, *le Vieux célibataire*, *les Cinq étages*, *le Vieux caporal*, etc.].—There is art in his choice of his choruses;—which almost always express in a single verse the theme of the entire song;—while he always leads up to the chorus with the utmost ease and naturalness [Cf. *Mon habit*, *les Cartes*, *la Fille du peuple*, *le Vieux vagabond*].—There is still more art in the way in which his songs are "composed";—they may be said to be so many "genre" pictures;—appealing directly to the eye;—and inviting illustration.—Of the depiction of bourgeois life in Béranger's songs;—and that there exists no surer evidence respecting;—or more least unexpected nor the least natural result of the great wars of the Empire. Over a period of twenty years a mixture of races to which nothing similar had been seen for centuries, had taken place on the battlefields of Europe, where the blood that had been shed had ended in cementing, as it were, a sort of European community. "We should aim at having a European bent of mind," wrote Mme de Staël, around whom, at Coppet, an entire school had grown up, whose labours, after perhaps inspiring hers, now complete, continue and prolong them. Through the wide-open breach there enter not only Shakespeare, accepted without restriction, but the Italians Alfieri and Manzoni, and the Germans

accurate and more faithfully limned representation of the life of the lower French middle-class between 1815 and 1830.—Again there is much art in the way in which the rhythm of the Songs is suited to the sentiments they convey;—as also in the choice of expression;—and in the clearness of the style.—Of Béranger as a writer;—and that some few rather ridiculous lines do not prevent his having a right to this title.—As has been said of him with propriety; "he is a great prose writer who has fitted his prose with rhymes."

On the other hand it is difficult to term him a poet;—though doubtless he has here and there been successful in giving poetic expression to such poetry as is occasionally offered by bourgeois life [Cf. *la Bonne vieille*, *le Vieux célibataire*];—and, in this connection, of the poetry of old age in Béranger's work.—Occasionally, too, he has struck a patriotic note [Cf. *le Vieux drapeau*, *le Cinq mai*, *les Souvenirs du peuple*].—In general, however, he lacked force and, still more, elevation when expressing strong sentiments.—He was also wanting in generosity of feeling;—and far from having raised the Song to the level of the Ode;—it was on the contrary the triumph of the Ode;—and in general of Romantic lyricism;—that opened people's eyes to the "prosaicness" of Béranger's songs.

Béranger's correspondence;—and that incomplete though it is,—though the four volumes of it we possess may not justify the enthusiasm of his admirers;—it is a part of his work that merits attention.—It contains nothing very striking;—and nothing that is evidence of conspicuous large-mindedness;—but it completes our

Schiller, Goethe, Burger, Novalis, and Hoffmann, to be followed shortly by the philosophers Kant, Fichte, and Schelling. Nor must the Scotchmen Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart be forgotten. The events of 1815 accelerate the movement, which is furthered, too, by the returning emigrants, of whom it would be a mistake to believe that they have "neither forgotten anything nor learned anything" during their exile: they have learned English or German, and that France does not constitute the universe. In this way, during the early years of the Restoration, between 1815 and 1825, there comes into existence a common mode of thinking and still more of feeling; the limits of the old horizon are extended,

---

insight into Béranger's character; — and shows us, behind the Béranger of popular legend, a dexterous, cautious, and calculating man;—and a writer who has never been surpassed for the skill with which he turned his popularity to the utmost account.—The literary criticism in Béranger's correspondence [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. i.].—His last years,—his death,—and his "funeral."

3. THE WORKS.—Béranger's works are practically restricted to his Songs, of which the principal original editions are those of 1815, Paris, Eymery;—1821, Paris, Firmin Didot;—1825, Plassan;—1827, Brussels;—1834, Paris, Perrotin;—and 1857 (his last songs), Perrotin.

Sainte-Beuve [*Causeries du lundi*, vol. ii., 1850] has proposed the following more critical classification of his songs: (1) *Old-fashioned songs*, in the style of Panard and Desaugiers: *le Roi d'Yvetot*; *la Gaudriole*; *M. Grégoire*;—(2) *Sentimental songs*, such as *le Bon veillard*, *le Voyageur*, *les Hirondelles*;—(3) *Party and patriotic songs* [among which one is surprised to see Sainte-Beuve, who is usually less accommodating, include *le Dieu des bonnes gens*];—(4) *Satirical songs*, such as *le Ventru* or the *Clefs du Paradis*;—(5) *Poetic songs*, such as *les Contrebandiers*, *le Vieux vagabond*, *les Bohémiens*.

We have already said that to the Songs have to be added Béranger's Memoirs, *Ma Biographie*, 1857, and his Correspondence in four volumes.

or rather they disappear, and literary cosmopolitanism comes into being. It differs from the old humanism in this, that instead of taking Greco-Latin culture for its foundation, it proposes to appropriate, to assimilate as completely as possible, what is most national in the "national" literatures; and the universality it aims at is an universality, not of abstraction or generalisation, but of composition, under the sway of which each element, far from renouncing, will develop its originality owing to its very contrast with the other elements.✓

To this evolution of criticism corresponds a parallel evolution of history, or rather the two are identical, if space and time, as Kant has just demonstrated, form

VIII.—**Hugues-Félicité-Robert de Lamennais** [Saint-Malo, 1783; † 1854, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Lamennais' Correspondence;—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, 1832, 1834, 1836; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. i., 1861, and vol. xi., 1868.

Censure de cinquante-six propositions extraites des écrits de M. de Lamennais . . . par plusieurs évêques de France, Toulouse, 1836;—the papal Encyclical *Mirari vos* . . . printed in Lamennais' volume *Les Affaires de Rome*, 1836–1837;—and the Encyclical *Singulari nos* . . . to be found in the same work.

Ange Blaize, *Essai biographique sur M. de Lamennais*, 1857;—E. Forgues, *Notes et Souvenirs*, preceding his edition of the *Correspondance de Lamennais*, 1859;—Ernest Renan, *Lamennais et ses écrits*, 1857 [in his *Essais de morale et de critique*];—Edmond Scherer, *Lamennais*, 1859 [in his *Mélanges de critique religieuse*];—Louis Binaut, *Lamennais et sa philosophie*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 15, 1860;—Ravaisson, *Rapport sur les progrès de la philosophie en France au XIX^e siècle*, 1868;—P. Janet, *La philosophie de Lamennais*, 1890;—E. Spuller, *Lamennais*, Paris, 1892;—A. Roussel, of the Oratory of Rennes, *Lamennais, d'après des documents inédits*, Rennes, 1892;—Mercier, S. J., *Lamennais d'après sa correspondance et de récents travaux*, Paris, 1893;—P. Le Cannet, *La Jeunesse de Montalembert*, Paris, 1896;—Ém. Faguet, *Politiques et Moralistes*, Paris, 1898.

together but one and the same category of pure reason. The sentiment of the diversity of places is inseparable from that of the diversity of periods; and the two combined constitute local colour. The honour of having revealed the importance of this conception to his contemporaries must be ascribed to Augustin Thierry, for without any desire to belittle the merit that accrues to Vitet for his *Etats de Blois*, or to Vigny for his *Cinq-Mars*, it must yet be borne in mind that these two works were preceded in 1825 by the *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands.* The part taken by Augustin Thierry in the formation of the doctrine of Romanticism has been underestimated, and it is time to repair this injustice,

2. THE RÔLE OF LAMENNAIS;—and that nobody perhaps, in recent times, has exerted a more considerable influence on the history of religious ideas.

Lamennais' birth and early education.—His early writings: the *Réflexions sur l'état de l'Église en 1808*, suppressed by the Imperial police;—and the *Tradition de l'Église sur l'institution des évêques*, 1814.—His visit to England, 1814–1815;—and the issue of the first volume of the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*, 1817.—Emotion aroused by this work;—an emotion that is increased by the publication of the second volume in 1821.—Lamennais, attacked by a portion of the French clergy,—is defended by de Maistre and Bonald [Cf. de Maistre, Correspondence, September, 1820; and Bonald, *Mélanges*].—He replies himself to these attacks in his *Défense de l'Essai sur l'indifférence*, 1821;—the first effect of which work is to make him numerous enemies at Rome.—He visits Rome, 1824.—His return to France.—Foundation of the *Mémorial catholique* and of the Association for the Defence of Religion.—Publication of the *Progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église*, 1828–1829.—Lamennais' conflict with M. de Frayssinous and M. de Vatimesnil.—The revolution of 1830, and the foundation of the newspaper *l'Avenir*.—Fresh difficulties.—Second journey to Rome, 1832.—Lamennais' submission, dissolution of the Catholic Association, and definite suppression of *l'Avenir*, 1832 [Cf. *Affaires de Rome*].—Lamennais' difficult situation.—He publishes his *Paroles d'un croyant*, 1834.—Prodigious effect of this book [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, since it may be that of all the conquests made by Romanticism it is Thierry who realised one of the most durable.

Ought a like reparation to be accorded the writers on the *Globe* or, on the contrary, has not somewhat too much been made, in almost all histories of literature, of the group whose principal members were Ampère and Rémusat, Dubois and Magnin? Goethe, who read them with an assiduous attention which was explained in part by the terms in which they were accustomed to speak of him, esteemed them "supremely daring"! [Cf. Conversations with Eckermann]. To-day, we are rather inclined to smile at the daring of Jean-Jacques Ampère and

---

Portraits contemporains, 1834].—The Encyclical *Singulare nos* . . . 1834, and the condemnation of Lamennais.—He rejoins by issuing the volume entitled *Les Affaires de Rome*, 1836,—which brings to a close the first series of his works and the first period of his life.

Whether the second period of his life differs as profoundly from the first as Lamennais himself believed?—and that in reality, although the means he resorted to were different,—it might almost be contended that the end he had in view remained substantially the same.

His aim was to establish the sovereignty of religion amongst men; —and it was to this end that he wrote the *Essai sur l'indifférence*;— while as several ways of attempting to effect his purpose were open to him;—he began by calling on "the old-established sovereignties to league themselves" against the growing progress of irreligion.— Perceiving, however, that the old-established sovereignties were only disposed to defend such of the elements of religion as they believed to be serviceable to their own interests;—and seeing that in consequence of their attitude the suspicion with which they were regarded by the political parties tended to fasten on religion itself;— he conceived the idea of separating religion and politics;—and, as Renan appropriately puts it, of constituting a religious party;—an idea which was the starting-point of the movement which has since come to be known as "Liberal Catholicism."

Rome, for reasons of which she was alone the judge,—though they were not without their political value in 1836,—refused to follow his lead, or to allow herself to be enticed into adopting this policy.—

Charles Magnin; and which of their writings seem to call for mention? Let it simply be said then that they had their share of influence both as continuators of Mme de Staël, and as having formulated the principle of the distinction between "literary" works and works that do not belong to literature. In this latter connection, it might be said that the theory of art for art is contained in germ in their writings, surprised though they were destined to be to see it evolved therefrom. They also helped Romanticism to emancipate itself from a political tutelage it was beginning to find burdensome. For all these reasons, even if they cease to be read, they will not be grudged the gratitude that is due to

Lamennais' rupture with the Papacy was due to motives which he has set forth himself [Cf. *Affaires de Rome*];—and in this way he was brought to state the question in the following terms: "What is Christianity considered in its relation to human societies? What is it that characterises it? What order of thoughts and sentiments has it developed in the world? On what fundamental ideas of right and justice has it established the mutual relations between men?—But to the question stated in these terms,—which are tantamount to the suppression of history,—he could only give one answer;—he who at an earlier date had founded religion itself on the authority of "universal consent";—and this answer was that Christianity and democracy are one and the same thing.

We have here the origin of what has since been called "social Christianity" or "Christian Socialism";—the irresistible trend of which is towards pure Socialism,—directly it breaks away from authority and tradition.—Nevertheless we return to the point from which we started;—and Lamennais' error does not consist in his having contradicted himself;—but in his having desired to establish between the two terms religion and democracy,—an identity which would render them always convertible;—while it left him no alternative but to be a pure democrat,—should the Church refuse to admit this identity.

Lamennais' other writings;—and how inferior they are to his earlier productions;—if an exception be made in favour of his *Esquisse d'une philosophie*, 1841–1846;—which has been said with truth to those who are sincere lovers of literature and who faithfully serve its interests—though without contributing much to its glory. In the articles of the *Globe*, as in the lectures at the Sorbonne, towards the same period, of Villemain, Guizot and Cousin, the old and the new æsthetics,—university criticism and Romantic criticism,—endeavoured to effect their mutual reconciliation: an effort attended, it must be confessed, with only a limited measure of success.

Numerous definitions have been given of Romanticism, and still others are continually being offered, and all or almost all of them contain a part of the truth. Mme de Staël was right when she asserted in her *Allemagne* that

---

be "a philosophy of evolution" [Cf. Paul Janet, *La philosophie de Lamennais*];—while it contains some of the finest passages he has written [Cf. his *Esthétique*].—Still, his great works are his early works:—and it is by them that the writer must be judged.—He is one of the most powerful of contemporary writers,—but his peculiarity is that while his style is one of the least "personal" that can be mentioned,—few authors have held "stronger" ideas.—His style, too, which was very harsh to begin with [Cf. *Essai sur l'indifférence*, vols. i. and ii.],—softened down as he grew older [Cf. his accounts of his journey in the *Affaires de Rome*];—while if there are traces of imitation and declamation in the *Paroles d'un croyant*,—there is poetry as well.

3. The Works.—There are two editions of Lamennais' complete works, one in twelve volumes, Paris, 1836–1837, P. Daubrée and Cailleux;—and the other in ten volumes, Paris, 1844, Pagnerre.—Both editions are very incomplete, and to the writings contained in these editions must be added:—*Amschaspands et Darvands*, 1843;—*Le deuil de la Pologne*, 1846;—the *Esquisse d'une philosophie*, 1841–1846;—the *Mélanges philosophiques et politiques*, 1856;—his translation of the Gospels;—and his translation of the Divine Comedy [posthumous], 1855–1858.

Of his correspondence, still very incomplete, has been published up to now: 2 vols. in 1859, Paris, Paulin;—2 vols. in 1863, Paris, Dentu;—1 vol. in 1884 (*Correspondance avec M. de Vitrolles*), Paris, Charpentier;—1 vol. in 1897 (*Correspondance avec Monta-*

"Paganism and Christianity, the North and the South, antiquity and the Middle Ages, chivalry and the institutions of Greece and Rome," having divided between them the history of literature, Romanticism in consequence, in contrast to Classicism, was a combination of chivalry, the Middle Ages, the "literatures of the North" and Christianity [Cf. *De l'Allemagne*, part ii., chap. ii.]. It should be noted, in this connection, that some thirty years later Heinrich Heine, in the book in which he will rewrite that of Mme de Staël, will not give such a very different idea of Romanticism! On the other hand, Stendhal, for his part, was not wrong when he wrote in 1824: "Romanticism is the art of acquainting the nations with those

---

lembert), Paris, Perrin;—and 1 vol. in 1898 (*Correspondance avec Benoit d'Azy*), Paris, Perrin.

IX.—**Stendhal (Marie-Henri Beyle)** [Grenoble, 1783; † 1842, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—*Journal de Stendhal*, Paris, 1888; *Vie de Henri Brûlard*, Paris, 1890; *Souvenirs d'égotisme*, 1892, posthumous works published by M. Casimir Stryienski;—R. Colomb, *Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Beyle*, preceding Hetzel's edition of the *Chartreuse de Parme*, 1846.

H. de Balzac's article [1840] printed at the end of Hetzel's edition of the *Chartreuse de Parme*;—P. Mérimée, *H. B.*, Paris, 1850;—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix., 1854;—Taine, *Essais de critique et d'histoire*, Paris, 1857 [the article is only to be found in the 2nd edition];—A. Collignon, *L'art et la vie de Stendhal*, Paris, 1868;—A. Paton, *Henri Beyle*, London, 1874; — Émile Zola, *Les romanciers naturalistes*, 1881; — P. Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, Paris, 1883;—Edouard Rod, *Stendhal*, in the "Grands Écrivains français" series, Paris, 1892.

2. THE WRITER;—and to begin with, of the traces there are in his work of the influence of the Ideologists and even of the Encyclopedists.—Stendhal's first masters: Montesquieu, Marivaux, Duclos, Helvétius, Cabanis.—Henri Beyle's military and administrative career

literary works which, given the state of their customs or their beliefs, are susceptible of procuring them the greatest possible degree of pleasure" [Cf. *Racine et Shakespeare*]. It has been remarked, however, in regard to this declaration, that, if "Romanticism" were merely equivalent to "Modernism," Racine, Boileau, and Voltaire would have been Romanticists in their time, a proposition that is wholly indefensible. Shall we recall yet other definitions, that of Hugo for example? After asserting in 1824, in the second preface to the *Odes*, "that he was absolutely ignorant of what was meant by the Classic school and the Romantic school," he nevertheless defined Romanticism, three years later, in the preface to Crom-

1800–1814;—and that he acquired early an experience of life that is uncommon among men of letters.—His admiration for Napoleon [Cf. *Le Rouge et le Noir* and his *Vie de Napoléon*].—His long residence at Milan, 1814–1817 and 1817–1821 [Cf. the *Chartreues de Parme*, chap. i., and the celebrated epitaph: *Arrigho Beyle, Milanese*]—Stendhal's early writings: *Vies de Haydn, Mozart et Métastase*, 1814, 2nd edition, 1817;—and the *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, 1817.—His relations with Lord Byron and Destutt de Tracy.—The volume entitled *Amour*, 1822;—and that it might easily pass for a work of the eighteenth century;—owing to the jejuneness and sustained irony of its tone;—to its affectation of cynicism;—and to its desultory composition.—Still the influence of Cabanis is plainly discernible in the work [Cf. *Rapports du physique et du moral*];—which contains, moreover, two or three new and original elements;—that make of Stendhal one of the forerunners of Romanticism.—His intervention in the quarrel: *Racine et Shakespeare*, 1823;—and that it is worth noting that this book appeared in part in an English magazine;—if the fact may be taken as evidence of Beyle's cosmopolitanism.—The *Promenades dans Rome*, 1829;—and *Le Rouge et le Noir*, 1830.

That Stendhal, besides helping in a general way to direct attention to foreign literatures, supplied Romanticism with the three essential principles of its æsthetic system, even although he may not have clearly defined them.—These principles are:—1. The *Principle of the equivalence of the arts*;—or of the possibility of a perpetual exchange well, to be the mingling of the branches of literature, the alternating the sublime with the grotesque, and finally the substitution, as the ideal of art, of an "effort to render character" for the realisation of beauty. There are further the ironical definitions contained in Musset's *Lettres de Dupuis et Cotonet* (1836); definitions which, although they are not so much witty as intended to be so, possess the great advantage over all the others of being "successive," and thus of putting the question as it ought to be put. The definition of Romanticism is a question neither of etymology nor of doctrine, but of history; and the word "Romanticism," having in itself no principal or primary signification, merely conveys the

---

of their respective "methods,"—and, in consequence, of their effects,—between poetry, painting, and music;—2. the *Principle that the representation of character* is the essential object of art;—so far as character is the expression of the physiological "temperament" of individuals;—and of nations;—3. The *Principle of the glorification of energy*;—if his admiration for Napoleon;—for Italy;—and for England prove essentially that he sympathised with the resistance of individuals to the conventions and laws of society.—He was also one of the first to make the "cultivation of the individuality" the law of the development of the artist.

It was due to other and different, though allied, reasons;—that he himself outlived Romanticism;—for instance to his taste for minor or precise and "documentary" details;—to his tendency to transform particular incidents into laws of the intelligence or of nature;—to his anonymous or impersonal but, in particular, "analytic" manner of writing;—and also, indeed, to the value of certain of his observations.—It may be questioned, however, whether the "documentary" value, and still more whether the literary value, of the *Chartreuse de Parme*, 1839,—are as considerable as has sometimes been maintained;—or, again, whether the profoundness of the work is not often more apparent than real?—and, in this connection, of the strange pretension of ironists to make the reader believe that merely because they indulge in raillery he ought to credit them with being thinkers.—Stendhal's last works: *Vittoria Accoramboni*, 1837;—*Les Cenci*; *La duchesse de Palliano*, 1838;—*L'Abbesse de Castro*, 1839.—Stendhal's letter to different meanings which have been given it in the course of history; in the course, that is, of time, by men and by literary works.

Still, in spite of the multiplicity of senses which have been attributed in turn to Romanticism by Hugo, Dumas, Vigny, Musset, Saint-Beuve, or George Sand,—to omit minor names,—and of the diversity of its characteristics, if it be essayed to isolate and determine a single feature that shall include all the others, there would not seem to be room for long hesitation. Romanticism is above everything else the triumph in literature and art of individualism, the entire and absolute emancipation of the Ego. Once again we are confronted by the influence,

---

Balzac, 1840;—and the two sentences of it that have become famous: "The *Chartreuse de Parme* is written in the style of the Civil Code";—and: "I fancy that I may perhaps meet with some success towards 1880."

3. The Works.—Stendhal's works comprise:

(1) His novels, all of which we have mentioned with the exception of the first: *Armance*, 1827;—his *Chroniques italiennes*, 1855; and *Lamiel*, published in 1888 by M. Stryienski;

(2) His critical works [art criticism or literary criticism], of which the principal are: the *Vies de Haydn, Mozart et Métastase*, 1814–1817 [under the pseudonym of Louis César Alexandre Bombet];—the *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, 1817, by M. B. A. A.;—*Rome, Naples et Florence*, 1817;—*Racine et Shakespeare*, part i., 1823, and part ii., 1825;—*Vie de Rossini*, 1824;—and *Promenades dans Rome*, Paris, 1829;

(3) His miscellaneous works, of which the principal are: *L'Amour*, 1822;—*Mémoires d'un touriste*, 1838;—his correspondence, two volumes of which were published in 1855;—and a volume of Letters to his Sister, 1892.

An edition of his complete works has been issued in 13 volumes, followed by 4 volumes containing his posthumous works, Paris, 1853–1855, Calmann Lévy. There have since been added the *Vie de Napoléon*, 1876; and the five or six volumes published by M. Casimir Stryienski.

victorious at last over the obstacles that had long stood in its way, of Rousseau and Chateaubriand. Each of us, according to the Romanticists, is his own undisputed master. The artist and the poet, as such, are subject to but one law and as men have but one duty: it is incumbent on them to reveal themselves in their works. Their contemporaries may ask no more of them, and they themselves can accomplish no more without being wanting in the respect they owe in some sort to their own originality. But as we have insisted on this point, on various occasions, so strongly that we may deem it useless to again lay stress on it, we shall content ourselves with adding that between

X.—**Alphonse-Marie-Louis Prat de Lamartine** [Mâcon, 1790; † 1869, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Lamartine's correspondence, edited by Mme Valentine de Lamartine, 1st edition, 1873–1875; and 2nd edition, 1881–1882 [completer but still very incomplete];—his *Confidences*, 1849;—his *Nouvelles confidences*, 1851;—his *Mémoires inédits* [1790–1815], 1870;—and the *Manuscrit de ma mère*, 1871.

Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. i., 1832, 1836, 1839; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. i., 1849; and vol. iv., 1851;—A. Vinet, *Études sur la littérature française au XIXe siècle*, vol. ii., 1845;—Gustave Planche's articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June, 1851, November, 1859;—Cuvillier-Fleury, *Dernières études littéraires*, 1859, —Victor de Laprade, *Le sentiment de la nature chez les modernes*, 1868;—Eugène Pelletan, *Lamartine, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1869; Ch. de Mazade, *Lamartine, sa vie littéraire et politique*, Paris, 1870; —Emile Ollivier, *Lamartine*, Paris, 1874;—Ernest Legouvé, *Soixante ans de souvenirs*, Paris, 1876;— Ch. Alexandre, *Souvenirs sur Lamartine*, Paris, 1884;—F. Brunetière, *La poésie de Lamartine*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, August, 1886; and *L'évolution de la poésie lyrique*, vol. i., 1894;—Em. Faguet, *XIXe siècle*, 1887;—Ch. de Pomairols, *Lamartine*, Paris, 1889;—Chamborand de Périssat, *Lamartine inconnu*, 1891;—F. de Reyssié, *La Jeunesse de Lamartine*, Paris, 1892;—Em. Deschanel, *Lamartine*, Paris, 1893;—Jules Lemaître, *Les contemporains*, vol. vi., 1895;—É. Zyromski, *Lamartine, poète lyrique*, Paris, 1896.

1825 and 1835 there was nothing,—from the example of Byron to the "subjective idealism" of Fichte,—that did not concur to favour this development of individualism. Moreover, this is precisely why, of all the characteristics of Romanticism, none is more essential than individualism: by which I mean that none better explains the causes of its rise and fall and the nature of the reaction it was destined to provoke.

The truth is that all the other matters about which so much noise was made—hostility to Classicism, liberty, truth in art, local colour, the imitation of foreign literatures—merely served to cover or disguise the primary preoccupation of the period, which was self-exhibition.

2. THE POET,—and that whatever may have been his rôle in other fields,—whatever disdain he may have affected at times for poetry;—and finally whatever be the service he may have rendered France on one memorable occasion;—his glory will always be that he is the author of the *Méditations* and the *Harmonies*;—and not that he wrote the *Histoire de la Restauration*, or even the *Histoire des Girondins*.

His birth and education [Cf. his Correspondence, which is full of precious information]. — Lamartine's family; — and of a remark of Sainte-Beuve's: "that it is an excellent thing to come of a sound stock." — The sentiment of nature;—and that to possess it Lamartine had no need to acquire it;—as he was imbued with it from his childhood upwards.—The religious sentiment;—and how much more sincere it is in Lamartine than in Chateaubriand;—or at least more "innate";—and perhaps, too, more favourable to poetry.—Natural nobleness of Lamartine's imagination.—His early verses [Cf. his Correspondence];—and their resemblance with those of Chênedollé;—but still more with those of Parny.—The Elvire of the *Méditations* [Cf. A. France, *L'Elvire de Lamartine*].—His essays in dramatic writing and his relations with Talma.—The publication of the *Méditations*, 1819.—They produce an incomparably greater effect than the poems of Chénier, 1819;—and give a new trend to poetry.—The *Nouvelles Méditations*, and the *Mort de Socrate*, 1823.—Stay in Italy.—The *Dernier chant du pélerinage de Childe Harold*, 1825.—Lamartine French chargé d'affaires at Florence.—He

Victor Hugo and Musset, the elder Dumas and George Sand, confined their imitation of Goethe or Byron to copying their practice of living their novels, of "romancifying" their lives, of introducing themselves into their works, of relating and publicly confessing their love affairs, after the manner of Goethe in *Werther*, and of Byron in *Don Juan*: they did not imitate either the rare perseverance with which Goethe endeavoured to perfect his individuality or the heroic death of Byron. Similarly, if we examine what constituted liberty in their eyes,—liberty *in* art, and not the liberty *of* art, which are two very different things,—it doubtless consisted neither in the right to choose their

composes the *Harmonies*;—returns to Paris.—Reception at the French Academy; — publication of the *Harmonies*, 1830. — He retires from his official position on the morrow of the Revolution of 1830;—and publishes his first political writing.—He is a candidate in the Var, but fails to be elected;—he leaves for the East; —his meeting with Lady Esther Stanhope.—Return to France, 1833;—publication of the *Voyage en Orient*, 1835;—and of *Jocelyn*, 1836.

A. The *Méditations*.—Of the general character of the first *Méditations*;—and that when they are compared with Béranger's Songs (1816–1824);—a comparison that is almost a sacrilege;—or even with the *Elégies* of Chénier (1819);—their most novel feature is found to be that their author returns to the genuine lyric "themes";—which are Nature, Love, and Death;—themes he treats with as much elevation as there is sensuality in Chénier's verses;—and sniggering "gauloiserie" or sly epicurism in Béranger's songs.—The *Mort de Socrate*;—and of Lamennais' aptitude for philosophic poetry [Cf. Voltaire in his *Discours sur l'homme*].—The *Nouvelles Méditations* [Cf. M. Pomairols, *Lamartine*];—and that this work, while offering the characteristics of the first volume of *Méditations*, is further distinguished by the union of more grace [Cf. *Ischia*] with more vigour [Cf. *le Crucifix*]; — and not less sincerity with greater virtuosity [Cf. *les Préludes*];—while it is at once the noblest and the most voluptuous work in French poetry.

B. *Jocelyn*;—and that it has the merit in the first place;—and the subjects, since no objection had been raised when Voltaire had gone for his subjects to America or China; nor in the right to write prose dramas, since *Cromwell, Hernant, Christini, Othello*, are in verse; nor even in the right to violate the "rules," since what "rules" can be said to have been in force in connection with the elegy, the ode, or the novel, and *Cinq-Mars*, the *Orientales*, *Notre-Dame de Paris*, the *Confessions de Joseph Delorme*, are they, or are they not, Romantic works? In short, it must be admitted that the Romanticists understood liberty merely as the right to be themselves in everything, to subordinate the "sovereignty" of the artist to no authority whatever, and to

merit is a real one;—of being the only "poem" of any considerable length that exists in French.—Of the subject of *Jocelyn*;—and of certain objections that have been urged in this connection [Cf. on this point the articles of Vinet and Em. Deschanel for one side of the argument and those of Sainte-Beuve and J. Lemaître for the other]. —That to blame Lamartine for not having married Jocelyn and Laurence;—is to blame Corneille for having separated Polyeucte and Pauline;—and to forget that beyond a doubt Corneille wrote his drama and Lamartine his poem solely with a view to bringing about this "separation."—Of a comparison Sainte-Beuve has made between the "country clergyman's poetry," which he pretends to admire particularly in *Jocelyn*; — and Wordsworth's poetry; — and that to adopt this attitude is to praise *Jocelyn* for its least merit; — for while the work really possesses the merit in question;—and is traversed by a vein of familiar poetry;—it also bears the imprint of the poet of the *Méditations*;—of his sentiment of nature;—and of his conception of love, always as chaste in its expression as it is ardent in its passion.—The work, too, displays that exuberance of inspiration and that descriptive facility which can only be found fault with on the score that they tend to develop themselves towards an abusive degree.—Finally, *Jocelyn* is illustrative of that "philosophic" side of Lamartine's poetry;—which we have already referred to in connection with the *Méditations*; — and which reminds the reader in places of Fénelon.

C. The *Harmonies*;—and that having appeared before *Jocelyn*;—

recognise no law beyond that of their caprice or their fancy:

> Toujours le cœur humain pour modèle et pour maître!
> Le cœur humain de qui? Le cœur humain de quoi?
> Quand le diable y serait, j'ai mon "cœur humain" moi!

Finally, if it has been possible to assert—and I believe I have myself made the remark—that Romanticism was in every respect the exact opposite of Classicism, the essential, the sole reason is that Classicism had made the impersonality of a work of art one of the conditions of its perfection.

This liberty for the artist to be himself and nothing

---

if we deal with them after that poem;—the reason is that "being written as they were felt, neither connectedly nor consecutively";—they are the very essence of Lamartine's poetry;—when instead of being kept under jealous control it is allowed to vent itself freely.—The *Harmonies* show the fundamental character of Lamartine's poetry;—which consists in an inability to set itself a limit;—and in a tendency towards philosophy;—and what is more, pantheistic philosophy;—and towards vagueness and indeterminateness in consequence of its exuberance.—At the same time the object of this remark is not to belittle the *Harmonies*;—since Lamartine, while following the general inspiration, attains in some passages to as great a precision as anywhere in his work [Cf. *Le premier regret*, *Milly ou la terre natale*];—but to show him losing his self-control;—unconcerned henceforth either with selecting his ideas;—or with restraining the ever more abundant flow of his improvisation;—and thus getting ready to write *La chute d'un ange*. Whether it is to be regretted that Lamartine turned his attention to politics;—and that in any case, from the moment of his doing so his poetic inspiration seems to have been, if not dried up, assuredly "unpersonalised."—However, he continues to occupy a place in the history of literature;—in virtue of some of his speeches [Cf. L. de Ronchaud, *La politique de Lamartine*, Paris, 1878];—of certain of his presentiments [Cf. E. M. de Vogué, *Heures d'histoire*, Paris, 1893];—of his *Histoire des Girondins*, 1847;—a work in which history is doubtless strangely distorted;—but certain pages of which but himself, or to "refract" in himself the universe, is also the explanation of the exuberance, richness, and brilliancy of Romantic lyricism. There is nothing in the French language superior to Lamartine's *Méditations,* to certain of the finest of Hugo's odes, — from the *Deux Iles* (1824) to the *Mages* (1856), — or to the *Nuits* of Alfred de Musset. If these very great poets do not always interest us when they talk of themselves, they never interest us except when they talk of themselves; or rather the happenings in history and in life by which they themselves were stirred are the origin and the theme of their songs, which do not interest us when they make them the vehicle merely of what is

---

could only have been written by a poet;—and finally in virtue of his personal novels: *Raphaël*, 1849;—the *Confidences*, 1849;—the *Nouvelles Confidences*, 1851;—*Graziella*, 1852.—Reduced henceforth to "writing for the booksellers,"—his books and newspaper articles contain, no doubt, some reminiscences of his past;—and in particular display more critical acumen and judgment than it is somewhat the fashion to allow;—but he has ceased to influence opinion;—and his literary rôle is terminated nearly fifteen years before his death.

3. THE WORKS.—Lamartine's Works comprise:

(1) His poetry: the *Méditations*, 1819;—*La mort de Socrate*, 1823;—the *Nouvelles Méditations*, 1823;—the *Dernier chant du pèlerinage de Childe-Harold*, 1825;—the *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses*, 1830;—*Jocelyn*, 1836;—*La chute d'un ange*, 1838;—the *Recueillements poétiques*, 1839.

To the above must be added the volume of *Poésies inédites*, published in 1873; and a certain number of youthful poems scattered through the first volume of his Correspondence;

(2) His novels: *Raphaël*, 1849;—*Geneviève*, 1850;—*Le tailleur de pierres de Saint-Point*, 1851;—*Graziella*, 1852;—and [although these works contain a large amount of truth mixed up with a great deal of imagination],—the *Confidences*, 1849;—and the *Nouvelles Confidences*, 1851;

(3) The *Voyage en Orient*, 1832–1833;

(4) The *Histoire des Girondins*, 1847;—and the *Histoire de la Restauration*, 1852, &c.;

most singular in their own nature; whereas our entire being thrills in harmony with their utterances when we find they express our own emotions reverberated, amplified and multiplied by the echo of their voice. It may be said indeed that they were the first to reveal to us that highest order of lyric poetry of which Ronsard had had but the presentiment, while Malherbe, by striking off in the direction of eloquence, had reduced it to a matter of laws. But the question arises, what is the difference between eloquence and lyricism, seeing that both are characterised by the same "movements," the same "imagery," and the same "qualities of language"? There is perhaps but one, and it is at the same time a very slight and a very great difference.

(5) The *Correspondance*;
(6) The *Cours familier de littérature*.

There are several editions of Lamartine's complete works: that published by Gosselin in 13 vols., Paris, 1840;—that by Furne, 8 vols., Paris, 1845–1849 [in reality these editions contain only the political works and the *Voyage en Orient*];—and that published by the author in 40 vols., Paris, Rue de la Ville-l'Évêque, 1860-1863 [which contains neither the Correspondence nor the whole of the *Cours familier de littérature*].

XI.—**The Sorbonne Triumvirate** [1815–1830].

Of the similarity between the careers of François Guizot [Nîmes, 1787; † 1874, Val-Richer];—Abel Villemain [Paris, 1790; † 1870, Paris];—and Victor Cousin [Paris, 1792; † 1867, Cannes];—and that it lies less in their having all three used literature as a stepping stone;—in their having all three been Minister of Public Instruction;—or even in their having all three of them been professors at the Sorbonne and at the same period;—than in their having aroused the same mistrust or the same enthusiasm by their teaching;—spread the fame of "professorial" eloquence until it rivalled that of the eloquence of the pulpit, the tribune, or the bar;—and given the same trend to philosophy and literary criticism.—For this reason they should be taken together;—and also because, not being very original, they were less genuine innovators than the eloquent spokesmen of the "common

While the orator endeavours to give the most general expression possible to his emotions so as to reach the widest and most varied audience, the poet, on the contrary, aims at giving the most individual expression he is able to the emotions that are common to everybody. Such, at any rate, was the mode of proceeding of Musset, Hugo, and Lamartine, and, *longo intervallo*, of the poet of *Iambes* or of that of the *Confessions de Joseph Delorme*. Yet all these writers have been reproached with being in general rather orators than poets. The reproach is based on a misconception at once of the conditions of lyricism and of the principle of Romanticism. If the writers in question are indeed the greatest of our lyric poets, the reason is that of all our poets they are the most per-

---

ideas" of their times :—less "thinkers" than "vulgarisers";—while at least two of them were "rhetoricians" rather than genuine orators —the exception being Guizot.

All three contributed to arouse curiosity in foreign literature and affairs :—Guizot by his translations of Shakespeare and Gibbon ;—and by his Histories, in writing which he had England perpetually in his mind's eye ;—Villemain, by the most celebrated of his series of lectures, the *Cours de littérature française au XVIII^e siècle* ; — in which English writers and, in particular, English political orators occupy as much space as French authors ;—and Cousin by his "adaptations" of the philosophy of Reid or Dugald-Stewart and of the metaphysics of Schelling and Hegel.—All three indulged in general criticism ;—or rather in "eclecticism";—Villemain in literature and with the greater acumen ;— Cousin in philosophy and with the more ardour ;— and Guizot in history and in the more formal spirit ;—but without possessing, in reality, in Guizot's case a personal method ;—in Cousin's an original philosophy ;—in Villemain's an artistic doctrine ;—and relying merely on the guidance afforded them by their "Liberalism."— However, if literary criticism, prior to Villemain, was based almost exclusively on the individual humour of the critic ;—philosophy, prior to Cousin, on the supposed necessity of having recourse to it to combat or bolster up this or that set of opinions ;—and history, prior to Guizot, on the desire to find in the past arguments applicable to the present ;—all three caused general criticism to achieve considerable sonal; and because they are the most personal, they are the most Romantic of our poets.

Their irresistible leaning to take themselves as their subject matter is, lastly, the starting-point of all the innovations it is only just to credit them with. If they rendered more pliant, if they, in a way, broke up the classic alexandrine, the reason is that it was to thought and still more to the feelings a sort of sheath or armour, whose rigidity lent itself ill to the exigencies of what is most personal in thought and in the feelings. Desirous of expressing the more inward emotions, the Romanticists stood in need of greater freedom of movement, and it was to secure it, and to no other end, that they reformed the alexandrine. They also felt the

---

progress by making it rest on principles which, though more or less debatable, were regarded at any rate as scientific.—Finally, all three by their manner of treating history, philosophy, and literary criticism,—brought into view the solidarity that exists between the elements of the same civilisation:—Guizot by including history, literature, and philosophy in his historical generalisations;—Cousin by showing the connection between Condillac's philosophy and the general spirit of the eighteenth century;—and Villemain by mingling history and literature.

All three of them too, though in different ways,—helped to direct "the century of criticism and history" into the path it was to follow;—to freshen the atmosphere of the higher French scholastic establishments;—and to bring the French educational programme into harmony with the spirit of the age.—As they all lived to a considerable age;—and exercised as Ministers, Councillors, and Academicians a great influence,—they each of them formed a school;—and brought the university into touch with "society";—from which it may be said to have been isolated for two centuries.—They also caused their own special studies to be accorded a place in "general literature";—and in this respect, since they did not confine their attention to France;—but followed the example set by Mme de Staël;—their influence was European as well as national;—and if only on this score they played their part, from amid the seclusion of the Sorbonne, in the formation of Romanticism;—so far as that movement was an effort to emancipate literature from purely classic tradition.

necessity of a more extended vocabulary. In this connection the following lines of Victor Hugo may be recalled: "When, in an effort to understand and to judge, I looked on nature and on art, the language was the image of the kingdom with its vulgar sort and its nobility; poetry was the monarchy, a word was a duke and peer, or a mere common fellow." The reason for what the poet says in these famous verses has been seen above. It is that at the period to which he refers even nature was merely expressed as a function of man, and man as a function of society. From the moment, however, that the individual was allowed to be wholly himself, these distinctions disappeared with the doctrine of which they were the expression; every word which helped the writer to mani-

XII.—**Jacques-Nicolas-Augustin Thierry** [Blois, 1795; † 1856, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Augustin Thierry, *Dix ans d'études historiques*, preface of 1840;—Charles Magnin, *Augustin Thierry*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May, 1841;—A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature française sous la Restauration*, 1853;—Ernest Renan, *Essais de morale et de critique*, 1857;—Pierre Dufay and René Ribour, *L Centenaire d'Augustin Thierry*, Blois, 1895.

2. THE TRANSFORMATION OF HISTORY;—and that it is no going too far to attribute it to Augustin Thierry;—the bent of whose mind was not greatly influenced,—it should be remarked in the first place,—either by the fact that he was for a time a student at the then recently founded École Normale Supérieure;—or by his relations with Saint-Simon;—and the Liberal newspapers of the period (1820);—the *Courier français*, for instance.—It was to begin with Chateaubriand;—and afterwards Walter Scott, who revealed to him his true vocation;—which was: (1) to introduce into history the sentiment of the *diversity of epochs*;—all, or almost all, of which had hitherto been confounded owing to the uniformity with which they had been depicted;—(2) to introduce into history, through the medium of the doctrine of the *irreducibleness of races*, a sort of physiological fatalism;—but also a leaven of poetry;—since, as we saw in connection with the Mediæval epopee,—all epopees are the expression of a racial

fest his personality passed muster; and individualism in literature as in politics ended in equality. And finally, was it not inevitable that in prose, as in verse, liberty in the choice of words should be followed by liberty as regards the turning of the sentence, a more varied vocabulary by a more pliant phraseology, a revolution in the language by a revolution in syntax?

Romanticism in short, from whatever point of view it be regarded, is found to mean individualism; or it may be said that lyricism is the medium by means of which individualism came forth out of Romanticism—and *vice versâ*. Further proof of this assertion is found in the contagious rapidity with which all three overran, pervaded, and transformed every branch of literature between

conflict;—and (3) finally, to show that an active preoccupation with the present throws a flood of light on the obscurities of the past;—and leads to an understanding of their true significance.

3. THE WORKS.—Augustin Thierry's works comprise:—

(1) His *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, 1820, augmented, corrected, and printed in volume form in 1827;—(2) his *Histoire de la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*, 1825, his principal work;—(3) his *Considérations sur l'histoire de France*, which is an introduction to the *Récits des temps mérovingiens*, 1840;—and (4) his *Essai sur la formation et le progrès du Tiers-État*, 1853.

The volume entitled *Dix ans d'études historiques*, published in 1834, contains, besides the *Lettres sur l'histoire de France* [new edition], essays on various subjects, historical, literary, and philosophic.

There are two editions of Augustin Thierry's complete works: Paris, 1859, Furne;—and Paris, 1883, F. Didot.

XIII.—Romantic Drama.

1. THE SOURCES.—G. Schlegel, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, 1814;—F. Guizot's preface to Letourneur's reprint of his Shakespeare, Paris, 1821;—Stendhal, *Racine et Shakespeare*, Paris, 1823–1825;—Ch. Magnin, *Le théâtre anglais à Paris*, 1827–1828 [in his *Causeries et Méditations*, vol. ii., Paris, 1843];—Benjamin Constant, *De Wallenstein et du théâtre allemand*, in his *Mélanges*, Paris, 1829;—

1830 and 1840. It is a matter of common knowledge that the plays of Hugo, of Musset, and of Dumas himself, that such fiction as Vigny's *Stello*, as George Sand's *Indiana*, *Valentine*, or *Lélia*, as the *Confession d'un Enfant du siècle*, are at once the most "Romantic" and the most "personal" works in French literature. The same must be said of Lamartine's *Raphaël* and of his *Graziella*. These writings in truth, to borrow Du Bellay's expression, are "merely the diaries of or the commentaries on" their authors' impressions of every description! But a circumstance still more worthy of attention is the fact that a like tendency is observable even in criticism. The early writings of Sainte-Beuve, the *Portraits littéraires*, or the *Portraits contemporains*,—at least when the writer

Fauriel, *Carmagnola et Adelghis*, two of Manzoni's tragedies, followed by a study entitled *Une lettre à M. C. sur l'Unité de temps et de lieu*, Paris, 1834 [Cf. Waille, *Le romantisme de Manzoni*, Algiers, 1890].

The prefaces of N. Lemercier; Alexandre Dumas; Alfred de Vigny; Victor Hugo, &c.

Jules Janin, *Histoire de la littérature dramatique*, Paris, 1853–1858;—Gustave Planche's dramatic criticisms in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1832–1857;—Théophile Gautier, *Histoire de l'art dramatique*, Paris, 1859;—Saint-Marc Girardin, *Cours de littérature dramatique*, Paris, 1853.

2. The Evolution of Romanticism in the Drama; and that its principle will be sought for in vain in the appropriation of English or German plays;—in the introduction on to the French stage of national subjects;—or in the employment of exotic backgrounds.—Romanticism, as far as the drama is concerned, consisted in proceeding in everything on exactly contrary lines to Classicism;—in denying the existence of the "rules";—and in claiming a liberty, the first effect of which was to lower tragedy to the level of melodrama.—The accuracy of this view may be established by considering the ground traversed,—by Vigny between *Othello*, 1829, and *Chatterton*, 1835;—by Hugo between *Cromwell*, 1827, and the *Burgraves*, 1843;—and by Dumas between *Henri III. et sa cour*, 1829, and *Mademoiselle de Belle-Isle*, 1839.—A second characteristic of Romantic drama is that

is to some extent sincere,—are merely the diary of the literary impressions of Joseph Delorme. And how shall we describe Michelet's Histories, if not as the lyric notation of the emotions their author experienced as he lived over again, in the peaceful silence of the archives, the shame or the glory of the past? To these names I would add those of Lacordaire and Berryer, were it not that, although the great preacher and the great orator have only been dead some thirty or forty years, their works have become almost unreadable.

A reaction was inevitable. "Men are made to live together and to form civil bodies and societies. But it must be remarked that none of the individuals who compose these societies will consent to be regarded

---

it breathes a spirit of revolt which,—without its being necessary to go as far as the lucubrations of Félix Pyat,—is easily recognisable in Dumas' *Antony*, 1831;—in Victor Hugo's *Le roi s'amuse*, 1832;—and even in Vigny's *Chatterton*, 1835.—But since the most unbridled liberty ends inevitably in fashioning a code for itself,—a final characteristic of Romantic drama is the affirmation of the sovereignty of passion;—and the glorification of crime under the name of energy.

Happily, while their imitators, a Frédéric Soulié for example,—carry the doctrine to extremes,—Vigny is saved from its consequences by the natural elevation of his character;—Hugo by his lyricism, which in *Hernani* or *Ruy Blas* raises him above his subject;—and Dumas by the fertility of his dramatic invention.—It thus happens that Romantic drama, after having made a great stir, but having accomplished comparatively little,—returns with the *Burgraves* to the epopee;—and with *Mademoiselle de Belle Isle* or *Les demoiselles de Saint-Cyr* to the drama as understood by Scribe;—without having conquered for the dramatic author anything more than a very vague general liberty;—the applications of which only become clear when contrasted with the obligations imposed by Classicism.—The Romantic drama is a Classic tragedy;—in which the author has the right to violate the three unities;—the personages of which may be mere private individuals;—and in which the "grotesque" is constantly alternating with the "sublime."

as the most inferior member of the body to which he belongs. It thus happens that those who vaunt themselves, raising themselves above their fellows, whom they regard as inferior members of society, necessarily render themselves odious to the entire community." The Romanticists were assuredly unacquainted with these words of the modest and timid Malebranche, but had it been otherwise they would have had little weight with them. They were mistaken, however, in neglecting this admonition, for what it is possible to put up with from the author of the *Méditations* or of the *Nuits*, becomes insupportable after a while even from a Sainte-Beuve,—it is of the poet I speak,—or a Desbordes-Valmore. We esteem it impertinence on their part to trouble us with

3. THE WORKS.—(1) Alfred de Vigny: *Le More de Venise*, 1829;—*La Maréchale d'Ancre*, 1831;—*Chatterton*, 1835.

(2) Victor Hugo: *Cromwell*, 1827;—*Hernani*, 1829;—*Marion Delorme*, 1830;—*Le roi s'amuse*, 1832;—*Lucrèce Borgia*, 1833;—*Marie Tudor*, 1833;—*Angelo*, 1835;—*Ruy Blas*, 1838;—*Les Burgraves*, 1843.

(3) Alexandre Dumas: *Henri III. et sa cour*, 1829;—*Christine à Fontainebleau*, 1830;—*Napoléon Bonaparte*, 1831;—*Antony*, 1831;—*Charles VII. chez ses grands vassaux*, 1831;—*Richard Darlington*, 1831;—*Teresa*, 1832;—*La Tour de Nesle*, 1832;—*Angèle*, 1833;—*Catherine Howard*, 1834;—*Don Juan de Marana*, 1836;—*Kean*, 1836;—*Caligula*, 1837;—*Paul Jones*, 1838;—*Mademoiselle de Belle-Isle*, 1839;—the *Alchimiste*, 1839;—*Un mariage sous Louis XV.*, 1841;—*Lorenzino*, 1842.

XIV.—**Alfred de Musset** [Paris, 1810; † 1857, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. ii., 1833, 1836, 1840; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. i., 1850, and vol. xiii., 1857;—Alfred de Musset's *Nuits*; and his *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, 1835;—George Sand, *Elle et lui*, Paris, 1859;—Paul de Musset, *Lui et Elle*, Paris, 1860; and *Biographie d'Alfred de Musset*, Paris, 1877;—Mme O. Jaubert [*née* d'Alton Shee], *Souvenirs*, Paris, 1881;—Émile Montégut, *Nos morts contemporains*, Paris, 1884;—Émile Faguet, *Dix-neuvième siècle*, Paris, 1887;—Jules Lemaître, *Intro-*

their personal concerns—as if we had none of our own! —and as they lack as a rule the gift of expression, we are irritated by their airs of superiority. They are well aware that this is the impression they create, and with a view to being able to pretend, on the strength of their originality, to a right to bore us with their affairs, they compose themselves, they laboriously attempt to compose themselves an originality, and in doing so quickly land themselves in the fantastic and the monstrous. They then claim for the maladies they have given themselves the indulgence and attention they despaired of obtaining by other means, and literature becomes pathological as a consequence of this self-exhibition. At this juncture, however, good sense revolts, common sense resumes its

duction au théâtre d'Alfred de Musset, Jouaust's edition, Paris, 1889–1891;—Arvède Barine, *Alfred de Musset*, in the "Grands Écrivains français" series, Paris, 1893;—F. Brunetière, *Évolution de la poésie lyrique*, 1895;—*Lettres d'Alfred de Musset et de George Sand*, edited by M. S. Rocheblave, Paris, 1897.

2. THE POET.—His middle-class extraction and his aristocratic pretensions;—his Voltairian education [Cf. what he says himself in the *Confession*, as to his early reading];—and the primary trait of his character, which is impatience or eagerness for pleasure.—His early poems;—and that they would be spoiled by a perpetual affectation of "dandyism" [Cf. *Mardoche*];—and of elegant debauchery, of the stamp of that of Laclos and the younger Crébillon [Cf. *Namouna*];—and as well by a phraseology which is still reminiscent of the eighteenth century;—if it were not for the beauty they derive from the "pride of life" with which they are instinct;—and from the ardent and objectless [Cf. *La Coupe et les lèvres*] passion they breathe.—Effect they produce among the "Romantic clique";—the premature reputation they procure their author;—and that never has a more precocious celebrity been purchased more dearly by a man more disposed to drain its intoxication to the dregs.

The "poet of love";—and that it is as the "poet of love" that Musset must always be thought of;—since although exception may and indeed must be taken to his style and versification;—more beautiful, more sincere, more impassioned, and more poignant love poems;

rights, and the sentiment of the social function of literature and art is reawakened. The public ventures at last to call in question the "sovereignty" to which the poet pretended. It is simultaneously perceived that the essential defect of Romanticism consists in this invasion by lyricism of all the branches of literature; and if further proof were wanted that Romanticism is at bottom lyricism, it would be found in the fact that the attempts that are beginning to be made to impose restrictions on the one result in the other losing ground.

The sensational failure of the *Burgraves* in 1843, contrasted with the not less sensational though certainly less merited success of Ponsard's *Lucrèce* in the same year, deals romantic drama a blow from which it did

---

—than the *Lettre à Lamartine* or the *Nuit d'octobre*;—do not exist in French.—Moreover, and with the exception of his *Lorenzaccio*;—which represents his contribution to the Romantic controversy;—his plays constitute one long hymn to love [Cf. *Les caprices de Marianne*; the *Chandelier*; *On ne badine pas avec l'amour*; *Il ne faut jurer de rien*; *Fantasio*, etc.];—and to love conceived as the sole reason for existence;—and for continuing to live.—Herein lies the secret of his dramatic strength;—and of the often unhealthy or questionable, but always infinitely seductive poetry that envelops his plays, as it were, in an atmosphere that is unique;—and herein lies in consequence the secret of the vitality of his work.—It may be, too, that the same qualities;—together with the information the work contains with regard to the "pathology of love";—save his *Confession* from what would otherwise be the disastrous effects of the declamation by which it is marred;—and finally that this worship of love constitutes almost the sole merit of his *Contes* and *Nouvelles*.

Remarks on this subject;—and that after all it was a happy thing for Musset that he was a victim of love;—if the result of his getting over his great crisis (1832–1837);—was to restore him to his former self;—and to make of him once more the "dandy";—or, as Flaubert put it, the *bourgeois*,—he was at the outset of his career.—That the "bourgeois" side of Musset's work is not, however, without its merit;—to appreciate which it is sufficient to term "Parisian" what Flaubert styled "bourgeois";—and thus to make the author of *Une* not recover. But François Ponsard is unequal to the task of playing the part with which he has been invested almost in spite of himself, and in reality it is Eugène Scribe and Alexandre Dumas, though they have far less "literary" pretensions than the author of *Lucrèce*, who bring back the drama to an understanding of its true conditions. The two playwrights must be taken together and reconciled in death, for if both of them write badly, almost as badly indeed as anybody has ever written in French, at any rate it cannot be said that either of them writes worse than the other. In any case they thoroughly comprehended that twelve or fifteen hundred spectators of all ages and ranks do not shut themselves up for four or five hours in a closed building to listen to

bonne fortune and of *Après une lecture*;—a lineal descendant of Voltaire, Regnard, Boileau, and La Fontaine.

3. THE WORKS.—Musset's works, which are excellently classified in the complete edition of them in 10 vols., Charpentier, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1876, 1886, comprise: (1) his Poems;—(2) his Plays;—(3) the *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*;—(4) his *Contes* and *Nouvelles*;—(5) his miscellaneous writings, and—(6) his posthumous works [Cf. Vte de Spoelberch, *Étude critique et bibliographique sur les Œuvres d'Alfred de Musset*, Paris, 1867; and Derôme, *Les éditions originales des romantiques*, vol. ii., Paris, 1887].

XV.—**Prosper Mérimée** [Paris, 1803; † 1870, Cannes].

1. THE SOURCES.—Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. iii., 1841; *Causeries du lundi*, vol. vii., 1853;—Taine, *Prosper Mérimée*, 1873;—Mérimée himself, *Lettres à une Inconnue*, 1873; and *Lettres à Panizzi*, 1881;—O. d'Haussonville, *Prosper Mérimée* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1879;—Maurice Tourneux, *Prosper Mérimée, sa bibliographie*, Paris, 1876; and *Prosper Mérimée, ses portraits*, etc., Paris, 1879;—Émile Faguet, *XIX^e siècle*, 1887;—Aug. Filon, *Mérimée*, Paris, 1893;—Mérimée, *Une correspondance inédite*, 1896.

2. THE RÔLE OF MÉRIMÉE;—and that it seems to have been that of an ironist;—who pretended to believe in Romanticism,—merely in order to become better acquainted with it;—to be able the better to ridicule it;—and finally to bring it into discredit.—Mérimée's first

an author talk to them of himself. In consequence, if they do not return to the ways of the classic drama—though it may be that what is best in Scribe is due to Beaumarchais—they tend in that direction, and their works, *Mademoiselle de Belle-Isle* (1839) and the *Demoiselles de Saint-Cyr* (1843), for example, or the *Bataille de Dames* and the *Verre d'eau*, are works of an undecided character that do not differ to a great extent either from each other or from the works of the past. They are doubtless lacking in observation and psychology, and also, I repeat, in style, but if only in consequence of the historical pretensions of which they make a show, some slight measure of reality is reintroduced into the drama, which seeks, as it were, in their writings to

works: the *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*, 1825,—and *La Guzla*, 1827;—and that if they are the work of a Romanticist as regards their "colour,"—as regards their initial idea they are that of a man of wide curiosity or of a dilettante;—the work, in fact, less of a disciple of Chateaubriand,—than of a pupil of Fauriel and of a friend of Stendhal.—The *Chronique du règne de Charles IX.*, 1829;—the *Vase étrusque*, 1830;—the *Double méprise*, 1833;—and that already in these last two works the author has almost discarded his Romanticism.—Those which followed: *Les âmes du Purgatoire*, 1834,—and the *Vénus d'Ille*, 1837, might seem to be a return to the Romantic formula;—but the tendency is only apparent;—as is proved by *Colomba*, 1840;—*Arséne Guillot*, 1844;—*Carmen*, 1845;—in which only two of the characteristics of Romanticism are met with: a striving after "local colour";—and the glorification of energy;—but scarcely any intention of self-exhibition.—These works are also free from declamation;—and the art in them consists, on the contrary, in the subjecting what is rare or singular to the ordinary conditions of reality.—This attitude would have sufficed,—even if it had not been accompanied by a taste for archæology and erudition,—to turn Mérimée's attention to history;—and it was as an historian that he ended;—though somewhat obscurely;—while the close of his career also found him ridiculing that "realism" of which he was one of the founders;—just as he had formerly ridiculed "Romanticism";—although fighting in its ranks.

return to its natural laws. The fact has been realised that the drama cannot exist in the absence of a subject of really general interest, and in particular of a certain "self-alienation," which, forbidding the poet to be preoccupied by his own individuality, leads him to embody himself in his personages. It is recognised, it is confessed that in the drama the individuality of the author must be subordinate to something outside itself; and this is tantamount to saying that the drama is unable to turn its methods to account so long as it continues to be Romantic.

But the evolution of the novel is about to further the development of the resources of the drama. It is at this juncture—towards 1840—that the author of

3. THE WORKS.—Mérimée's works comprise: (1) the *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*, 1825, and *La Guzla*, 1827;—(2) his *Nouvelles*, the principal of which have been mentioned;—(3) his historical writings, of which the principal are: his *Essai sur la guerre sociale*, 1841;—*Don Pedro de Castille*, 1848; and the *Faux Démétrius*, 1852;—(4) his archæological writings, the principal being his *Description des peintures de Saint-Savin*, 1845;—(5) his translations from the Russian: Pouchkine's *La dame de pique*; Gogol's *Inspecteur général*; Tourguenieff's *Apparitions*;—(6) four volumes of travels: *Dans le Midi de la France*; *Dans l'ouest*; *En Auvergne*; and *En Corse*; and numerous magazine articles, all of which have not been reprinted in volume form;—(7) his Correspondence composed so far of *Lettres à une inconnue*, 2 vols., 1873; *Lettres à une autre inconnue*, 1 vol., 1875; *Lettres à Panizzi*, 2 vols., 1881; and *Une correspondance inédite de P. Mérimée*, 1 vol., 1896. This Correspondence does not constitute the least interesting portion of his work, and we have reason to believe that it might easily be doubled in volume.

XVI. **Alexis-Charles-Henri Clérel de Tocqueville** [Paris, 1805; † 1859, Cannes].

1. THE SOURCES.—His *Correspondance inédite*, Paris, 1861; and his *Nouvelle correspondance inédite*, Paris, 1865;—G. de Beaumont,

Indiana, of *Valentine*, of *Lélia*, after having "sown her wild oats," so to speak, after occupying attention with the story of her marriage and the scandal of her love affairs, that George Sand herself begins to see that objective, impersonal and disinterested observation, which is the very definition of the novel, also constitutes its value. With the facility for going to extremes characteristic of women, and with their tendency to obey the masculine influences that sway them for the time being, George Sand, guided at first by Lamennais and afterwards by Pierre Leroux, passes at a bound from the subjective or lyric to the social and even the Socialist novel: with the result that the *Péché de M. Antoine* or the *Compagnon du Tour de France*, if they be novels at all, are

Notice sur Alexis de Tocqueville, preceding the latter's *Œuvres et correspondance inédites*, 1861, Paris;—L. de Loménie, *Esquisses historiques et littéraires*, Paris, 1859;—Sainte-Beuve, *Premiers lundis*, vol. ii., 1856; *Causeries du lundi*, vol. xv., 1860, 1861; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. x., 1865;—Émile Faguet, *Alexis de Tocqueville* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February, 1894;—G. d'Eichthal, *Alexis de Tocqueville*, Paris, 1897.

2. The Historian.—Originality of his manner;—which differs no less from that of Guizot, with which it has often been compared;—than from that of Thiers or that of Augustin Thierry.—*La Démocratie en Amérique*, 1835–1840;—and that Americans admit that nothing that has been written about them shows more conscientious observation;—or remains truer on the whole after a lapse of sixty years.—The reason is that the author combines the serene impersonality of the philosopher with the perspicacity of the born observer;—the disinterestedness of the man of learning with the curiosity of the politician;—and the art of formulating the laws of phenomena with that of grasping their essential character.—The *Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, 1856;—and that this book marks an epoch in the manner of conceiving the causes and of representing the history of the Revolution.—Tocqueville saw clearly: (1) that the work accomplished by the Revolution was the necessary sequel of the most remote French history;—(2) that the Revolution owed its "religious" character to the depth of its causes;—and (3) that

assuredly not good novels. Are those of Alexandre Dumas, Frédéric Soulié, and Eugéne Sue any better? Their vulgarity admitted, they are at least better composed, more interesting and more dramatic; while Eugène Sue's works, to an equal or greater degree than George Sand's, help by diverting attention from the miseries the Romanticists had brought into such strong relief, to direct it to other sufferings which are more real, deeper, and more cruel. Mention, too, may be made here of the names of Mérimée, Jules Sandeau, and Charles de Bernard. But it was reserved for Honoré de Balzac to rid the novel, by recourse to methods that are a further innovation, of the conventions of Romanticism, and to raise it in his masterpieces to a

for this reason it was beyond the power of any political force to nullify its effects.—By these two works Tocqueville contributed more than anybody else,—to make history independent of the arbitrary judgment of historians;—to pave the way for the conception of history that now obtains,—and to give history all the characteristics of a science it is susceptible of acquiring.

3. THE WORKS.—As we have neglected the politician in this article and merely considered the historian, we shall not refer to de Tocqueville's political writings: to his *Rapports*, *Discours* or *Souvenirs* [published in 1893].—His *Démocratie* appeared in 1835-1840;—his *Ancien Régime et la Révolution* in 1856.—His other historical writings consist of fragments, all of which bear on one or the other of these two works. His Correspondence, which is very interesting, has been published by Gustave de Beaumont, who accompanied him on his journey to the United States.

Mme de Tocqueville has edited his complete works in 9 vols., Paris, 1864-1868. The two volumes edited by M. G. de Beaumont form the fifth and sixth volumes of this edition.

perfection which perhaps has never since been surpassed —or equalled.

Doubtless there had been novels, and good novels, before the time of Balzac, and among them two or three —the *Princesse de Clèves*, *Gil Blas*, *Manon Lescaut*— which will last, it may be believed, as long as the French language. These productions, however, were merely happy "accidents," chance "finds," which were not of a nature to be repeated or to prove the parent stock of works of a like order. None of Balzac's predecessors had divined that the true rôle or the true literary function of the novel is to be the abridged representation of ordinary life. The novelist in reality is nothing more than a witness whose evidence should rival that of the

SECOND PERIOD.

From the performance of the "Burgraves" to the publication of the "Légende des siècles."

1843-1859

I.—Honoré de Balzac [Tours, 1799; † 1850, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.[1]—Balzac's Correspondence [1818–1850], forming vol. xxiv. of his complete works, Paris, 1876; and his *Lettres à l'étrangère* [Mme Hanska, afterwards Mme de Balzac] in the *Revue de Paris*, 1894, 1895, 1896.

Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. ii., 1836; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ii., 1850;—P. de Molène's articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, April, November, 1842, and June 1843;—Lerminier, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1847;—Mme de Surville [Balzac's sister], *Balzac, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1858, and preceding the volume containing his Correspondence.

Eugène Poitou, *M. de Balzac, ses œuvres et son influence*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December, 1856;—Taine, *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire* (the date of the article is 1858);—Th. Gautier, *Honoré de Balzac*, Paris, 1859;—Edmond Werdet, *Portrait intime de* historian in precision and trustworthiness. We look to him to teach us literally to see. We read his novels merely with a view to finding in them those aspects of existence which escape us owing to the very hurry and stir of life, an attitude we express by saying, that for a novel to be recognised as such, it must offer an historical or documentary value, a value precise and determined, particular and local, and as well a general and lasting psychological value or significance.

---

[1] Cf. *Histoire des Œuvres de Balzac* by the Vicomte Spœlberch de Lovenjoul, 3rd edition, Paris, 1888, Calmann Lévy.

Both these conditions are fulfilled by Balzac's novels. *Les Chouans,* although one of his earliest works, but more especially *Une ténébreuse affaire, Un ménage de garçon, César Birotteau, La Cousine Bette* are among the most lifelike pictures that exist of the revolutionary

Balzac, Paris, 1859;—Champfleury, *Grandes figures d'hier et d'aujourd'hui*, Paris, 1861;—Lamartine, *Balzac*, in his *Cours de littérature*, 1864, and in volume form, Paris, 1866;—Émile Zola, *Le roman expérimental*, 1880; and *Les romanciers naturalistes*, 1881;—Émile Faguet, *Dix-Neuvième siècle*, 1887;—Marcel Barrière, *l'Œuvre d'Honoré de Balzac*, Paris, 1890;—Julien Lemer, *Balzac, sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris, 1891;—Paul Flat, *Essais sur Balzac*, 1893; and *Nouveaux essais*, Paris, 1895;—Edmond Biré, *H. de Balzac*, Paris, 1897.

Anatole Cerfbeer and Jules Christophe, *Répertoire de la Comédie humaine*, Paris, 1887.

2. THE NOVELIST.

A. *His early years and career.*—His extraction;—and that he has many of the characteristics of the inhabitants of Touraine, and yet his mother was a Parisian and his father came from the Languedoc country.—His education at the college of Vendôme [Cf. *Louis Lambert*].—The years he passed in the offices of a lawyer and of a notary;—and the account to which he turned them;—learning not only the "procedure" which was to occupy so large a place in certain of his novels;—but acquiring a knowledge of "business" as well;—and of the part it plays in contemporary life.—His tragedy *Cromwell*, 1820 [unprinted],—and his first novels [under the pseudonym of Horace de Saint-Aubin],—and that it is useless to give their titles, as he disowned them.—His commercial undertakings; publishing, printing, period, the Empire, the Restoration, and the Government of July. But his studies of character are equally admirable, as is seen when he is depicting inveterate vice in Baron Hulot, or middle-class vanity in César Birotteau, or military haughtiness and brutality in Philippe Bridau, or the obsequiousness of the functionary in Marin de Gondreville. Be it added that love,—I say love and not women,—does not occupy a larger place in his books than is actually accorded to it in real life, while he gives hatred, vanity, ambition, avarice and all the passions their due importance. It would be difficult, again, to praise too highly his astonishingly exact and minute descriptions, or rather inventories, his "resuscitations" of periods and places, even his vivid sketches of fashions

---

type-founding;—and that it is curious to note that his efforts to make money always took the shape of some enterprise connected with the book trade.—Moreover, if he was unsuccessful both as a printer and type-founder,—the further experience he thus gained,—coming on the top of that he had acquired in the lawyer's and notary's offices, —contributed in no small measure to the composition of his talent.—The *Chouans*, 1827–1829;—the *Physiologie du mariage*, 1829–1830; —the *Maison du chat qui pelote*, the *Bal de Sceaux*, the *Vendetta*, 1830.—His feverish activity and his inordinate production [Cf. Ch. de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des Œuvres*, 3rd edit., pp. 315–328].—*Peau de chagrin*, 1831;—the *Muse du département*;—the *Curé de Tours*, *Louis Lambert*, 1832;—the *Médecin de campagne*; *Eugénie Grandet*, 1833.—The idea of the "Human Comedy" first occurs to him;—and he draws up its principal divisions.—The *Recherche de l'absolu*, 1834; —Sainte-Beuve's article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* [Cf. below]; —and Balzac's quarrel with Sainte-Beuve.—His financial embarrassment and lawsuits.—He frequents aristocratic society.—*Père Goriot*, 1835;—the *Contrat de mariage*, 1835;—the *Lys dans la vallée*, 1835;—Fresh lawsuits and fresh schemes. *La vieille fille*, 1836; —*Illusions perdues*, part i., 1837;—*Les employés*, 1837;—*César Birotteau*, 1837.—The incident of the Sardinian mines [Cf. his Correspondence for March and June, 1838].—He takes up his residence at the Jardies.—The *Curé de Village*, 1839;—his drama *Vautrin* is performed and then prohibited, 1840.—Foundation of which, although they lasted but a year or only a few months, have been immortalised by the master's laborious but powerful art. Whether better novels have ever been written, or will ever be written, than *Eugènie Grandet*, *Ursule Mirouet*, *Le Curé de Village* or *Le Cousin Pons*, I cannot say, but there are no novels like them in existence. But it is time to employ the only word that meets the case, while its application to Balzac will determine its true meaning, and prevent it from being falsely interpreted as has too often been done. Balzac's attitude towards his characters or the subject he is writing about, is that of the naturalist towards the animal or the plant he is studying. It is a patient and attentive attitude, an attitude "subservient to its object," and uninfluenced

the *Revue parisienne.—Pierrette*, 1840;—*Une ténébreuse affaire*, 1841;—*La Rabouilleuse* [*Un ménage de garçon*], 1841;—*Ursule Mirouet*, 1841.—Performance and failure of his piece *Les ressources de Quinola*, 1842.—The Introduction to the "Human Comedy" appears, 1842.

B. *Balzac's art*;—and to begin with, whether Balzac's style is so bad in general as has been asserted;—on the strength of some instances of exaggerated or incoherent metaphors;—or of far-fetched expressions;—and of the frequent use or abuse of the slang terms peculiar to the various professions or trades?—That in any case, when the justice of these criticisms has been recognised;—and when he has further been reproached with presenting his subjects in a manner that invites the charge of charlatanism;—owing to a perpetual affectation of profoundness,—displaying itself in high-sounding but often empty pronouncements;—it is still impossible not to accord him an unique "power of evocation";—and the gift, as he said himself, of having with the personages of his Comedy "competed with the Registrar of births."—There arises in this connection a question with which we have already been confronted [Cf. the article on Molière]:—can it be that this manner of writing, a manner as irregular, confused and jumbled as life itself, is a necessary condition of the representation of life?—The defects of Balzac's style are of the same nature,—having regard to differences of education and period,—as those of the style of Saint-Simon's Memoirs;—or as those perhaps of Shake-by any preconceived personal notions. He does not give us his impressions; it is reality, and reality in its entirety that he strives to grasp, as is indicated by the spacious lines on which his work is designed. In the "Human Comedy," glorying as much in forgetting himself as the Romanticists in thrusting themselves on our attention, his sole ambition was to reflect the history of his time with the utmost faithfulness compatible with the methods of his art.

To consummate the downfall of Romanticism, it was only necessary that it should be deserted by its chiefs or masters themselves; and this desertion was an accomplished fact. To say nothing of Lamartine, Victor Hugo, who had thrown himself into politics, had ceased to write

---

speare's style;—a circumstance which gives one pause;—but there is inducement to believe that it is for this reason that it has been possible to term Balzac,—after Saint-Simon and Shakespeare,—"the greatest repertory of documents bearing on human nature we possess."—The value of these "documents" has now to be examined.

1. They are in the first place *historical documents*;—and, in this connection, of Balzac's admiration for Sir Walter Scott [Cf. Introduction to the *Comédie humaine*; and the letter of January 20, 1838, to Mme Hanska].—The novels of the author of *Quentin Durward* and *Ivanhoe* are lifelike resuscitations of the past [Cf. Aug. Thierry's article on *Ivanhoe*];—and Balzac's novels resemble them in this respect.—No historian has given a more striking picture of the civil wars of the time of the French Revolution than the author of the *Chouans*;—the France of the First Empire is nowhere more vividly depicted than in *Une ténébreuse affaire* [Cf. Ernest Daudet, *La Police et les Chouans sous l'Empire*];—if the soldiers of the Restoration are anywhere conjured up before us it is in *Un ménage de garçon*;—and to see the middle classes of the time of Louis-Philippe live again before our eyes, we have only to open *César Birotteau* or *La Cousine Bette*.—It should be added that Balzac has recourse to the same expedients as Sir Walter Scott:—schedules, inventories, exact, minute, and picturesque descriptions of furniture and costumes;—"localisation" of provincial manners and of the various

plays, and was withholding his *Contemplations* from publication. Vigny, from the retirement of his "ivory tower," was issuing the *Mort du Loup*, the *Maison du Berger*, the *Bouteille à la mer*, works of which it may be said,—whatever further characteristics we may have to point out in them later,—that nothing could be less Romantic. Musset, whose error throughout had been his desire to conform his life to his poetry, was wearing himself out in debauchery; the *enfant terrible* of the party had become its most lamentable victim! Already, and without the least inquiry as to whether they were justified or not, the jests, dull though they were, which the author of *Jérôme Paturot à la recherche d'une position sociale* (1843) was making at the expense of the Romanticists in general

phases of Parisian life;—"genealogy," physiology, and detailed psychology of even his least important personages;—connection, by brief indications, of their private history with the general history of their time;—and generally whatever is wanting in this respect in *Volupté*;—in *Valentine* or *Indiana*;—in *Adolphe*.—This is Balzac's primary merit, and it is an unique merit.—He was the "historian" as well as the "painter" of the manners of his time;—of which he has noted the very evolution or movement;—as well as caught the physiognomy.—And while Walter Scott, to give us the sensation of the diversity of periods,—requires to be separated from the periods he depicts by a somewhat long interval,—Balzac has rendered the distinctive characteristics of the three or four generations of men it is possible to come into contact with in the course of a single life.

2. Balzac's documents in consequence are, in the second place, *realistic documents*;—for he has accorded a place in the novel to details which his predecessors had kept out of it as being vulgar or of little interest;—and in particular to all such details as relate to money questions [Cf. *Eugénie Grandet*; *César Birotteau*; *Les illusions perdues*; *La Cousine Bette*].—He may be said, indeed, to have made money the very soul of his plots;—instead of and in the place of love, which occupies but a secondary place in his works [Cf. *Le contrat de mariage*; *La recherche de l'Absolu*; *Les Paysans*; *Le Cousin Pons*];—and sometimes no place at all.—Moreover, as he was himself familiar with every description of financial embarrass-

and of the greatest of them in particular, were meeting with unanimous applause. Moreover, if it be true that a form of literature or a literary doctrine cannot disappear unless another form or another doctrine has taken its place, the novel has just been seen to have profited in the hands of Balzac by all the drama was losing, and realism to have been the gainer by the drooping fortunes of Romanticism. Something more, however, was wanted to change the retreat into a rout: the spectacle was needed of Romantic individualism at bay with its exact opposite, with what we should have liked to have termed socialism, if the word had not since acquired, unfortunately, so many dangerous and regrettable meanings!

ment;—the reality of his personal experience is superadded to the inevitable touch of realism lent the stage play or the novel by the introduction of money questions;—and he is the novelist of the money question,—as Musset is the poet of love.—He was alive to the exigencies imposed on the novel by the mere contention of dealing with the question of money in it.—Besides understanding the nature of the activity, intelligence, and acumen requisite for financial success;—matters which Scribe, on the contrary, never understood;—he recognised that he would have to introduce an entire class of men previously overlooked by novelists:—bankers, notaries, bailiffs, lawyers, usurers, and petty money-lenders;—that is an entire group of characters whose depiction or representation must result in realism;—since their lives hinge exclusively on the most concrete, and, in our modern civilisations, the most universal of realities.—After the money-makers, however, all the social classes made their entry into the novel;—with the infinite diversity of their professions and trades;—which it became necessary to distinguish by their genuine characteristics;—by the intellectual, psychological, or moral deformation which result from them;—soldiers and magistrates, artists and men of letters, functionaries and shop-keepers, diplomatists and politicians, doctors and persons of independent means;—it became necessary to be acquainted with these occupations, to describe and explain them;—and to describe them to employ the terms which constitute the vocabulary or slang of those

II

While the Romanticists were engaged in introspection, were probing " to its waste bottom the gulf within them," and finding nothing there, were unsuccessful in getting beyond themselves, were always harping on themselves and on themselves alone, there was coming into existence independently of them an immense movement in which not only they took no part, but of the very existence of which they were ignorant in their utter inability to discern its nature or gauge its significance. Their self-preoccupation blinded them to the progress of science, and the fact must be insisted on that never

---

who follow them;—as there are not two ways of saying that a bill has been dishonoured,—nor is there a literary paraphrase for designating a depilatory ointment.—Finally when he had conceived the idea of linking all his novels together;—and of making of them not a succession of episodes, one of which should be the continuation of another;—but a picture of the society of his time;—if he had overlooked some characteristic trait it became necessary that he should note the omission;—and then it was that he clearly perceived the realistic character of his work;—or, as it might also be called, its scientific character.

3. For, in the third place, his documents are assuredly *scientific documents*;—and it is no affectation on his part;—when he invokes the names of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire or Cuvier;—but the expression of his gratitude;—for it is a fact that he contributed to a greater extent than anybody else to make the history of manners a dependency or province of natural history [Cf. the Introduction to the *Comédie humaine*].—He had recourse, as naturalists do, to monographs [Cf. *Étude de femme*; *La femme de trente ans*; *Autre Étude de femme*; *l'Usurier Gobseck*];—in which he scarcely concerned himself with producing literature or art;—but rather with depicting his "subject" exactly as he had observed it.—Nobody has given so much attention as he to the reproduction of the "surroundings" in which he placed his characters [Cf. *La recherche de l'Absolu*; *Le Père Goriot*; *Le Cousin Pons*];—indeed, carried away by his

have poets existed, not forgetting Racine or Boileau, more wholly oblivious of whatever did not immediately concern their art—of mechanics or astronomy, of physics or chemistry, of natural history or physiology, of history and philosophy—than Lamartine, Hugo, Musset, Dumas, Gautier, and their fellows. Shall it be said that they had a right to adopt this attitude? It is certain that, just as "there is no need for a quadrant to journey with ease from Paris to Auvergne," so the utter indifference of a Musset or a Hugo to whatever did not concern their loves or their verses does not in the least detract from the beauty of the *Nuits* or the *Orientales*. They must even be admired for having, as Hugo did for example, "described" Greece or the East so admirably

subject, he has more than once gone to extremes in this connection;—and treated this branch of his work for its own sake.—His great ambition was to describe and classify "social species";—considered as analogous to "zoological species";—and capable, like these latter, of changing the one into the other;—a conception which, as has been quite rightly observed [Cf. Paul Flat, *Essais sur Balzac*],—is that of Evolution.—For this reason it is a mistake to talk of the immorality of his novels;—for they are not immoral in general, and with the exception of those which show traces of Romanticism [Cf. *Un grand homme de province à Paris*, or *La dernière incarnation de Vautrin*],—except in the way in which experience of life itself is immoral.—All that can be said is that his work bearing the imprint of his temperament;—he has not escaped the danger incident to all realism;—of regarding man as he would an animal;—of forgetting that man is man only so far as he avoids resembling an animal;—and that a social function attaches to art and literature;—if not to natural history.

By recourse to the methods just described, Balzac made the novel a "literary genus";—blending together for the first time the historic novel [in the manner of Walter Scott, or before him of Prévost];—the novel of manners [as seen in the works of the younger Crébillon, Fielding, and Marivaux];—the novel of character [as exemplified by Le Sage];—and the social or philosophic novel [as conceived by George Sand or Rousseau].—His success in combining these varieties without ever having seen them. At the same time, in proportion as the discoveries in every direction at once of a Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire or a Dumas—the chemist—of an Ampère or a Fresnel, of a Cauchy or a Fourier, gave almost infinite extension to the field of "objective" certitude, it was impossible that the confidence the Romanticists had placed in a purely "subjective" certitude should not be lessened to a corresponding extent, to the consequent undermining of the authority of the Individual. Since reality is not always in conformity with the idea we form of it, since this is a demonstrable fact, since indeed one of the habitual characteristics of scientific truth is that it is in contradiction with the evidence of our senses, it follows that the individual is not the "measure of all

of the novel was due to the fact that he discerned the ultimate purpose of all of them;—which is to realise an "image of contemporary life";—in which the individuals and the spheres in which they move are shown in their reciprocal reactions on one another;—and on this score it may be said that the novel as conceived by Balzac is a creation analogous to that of the comedy of Molière.—Balzac's last novels: *Modeste Mignon*, 1844;—*Les Paysans*, 1845;—*Le Cousin Pons*, 1846;—*La Cousine Bette*, 1847;—*Le Député d'Arcis* [unfinished], 1847;—and that three at least of them are among the best Balzac wrote.

C. *Balzac's influence.*—What precedes explains how it is that his influence has been so far-reaching;—and the truth is that since he first came to the front some sixty years ago,—no novels have been written in France or elsewhere that do not seem to show the influence of Balzac;—or if there has been a novel or a type of novel that has escaped his influence, it has suffered on that account and on that account alone.—The influence of the *Lys dans la vallée* is traceable in all psychological novels;—that of *Eugénie Grandet* or of *La Cousine Bette* in all novels that claim to be studies of character;—while the origin of the "detective" novel is to be found in *La dernière incarnation de Vautrin* or in *Une ténébreuse affaire*.—On the other hand, since Balzac, the novel of adventure has ceased to belong to literature;—and the sentimental novel has come to be regarded as of quite an inferior order;—the first because of things," that the sincerity of our impressions is no guarantee of their accuracy, and that we are merely their scene, while their judge is outside ourselves and our superior!

Such is the idea that is beginning to filter into men's minds, which before long it will dominate entirely. In the light of science, the reason is perceived of the resistance that had been offered the pretensions of Romanticism. The poet has not the right to assert that "he has his human heart" of his own, or at least we have the right for our part to declare that he is mistaken! And we in turn, on what shall we base our affirmation? Clearly not on our knowledge of ourselves, as to do so would be to argue in a vicious circle, but on observation of a more

the arbitrariness of its combinations;—the second because it is always a "confession" on the part of the novelist;—while both have fallen into disrepute because they are mere partial or illusory representations of life.—What is more, an entire generation of men that learned to read in Balzac's novels,—learned, as it were, to live in them;—and to borrow the expression of an illustrious naturalist [Louis Agassiz],—his personages have become "prophetic types";—from his "Gaudissarts" to his "Rastignacs" and his "Rubemprés."—We still elbow them in real life;—they have modelled themselves on Balzac's heroes;—and it thus happens that he "has competed with the Registrar of births" far more literally than he believed himself;—which is doubtless the highest praise it is possible to give the creative artist.

3. THE WORKS.—Balzac's works consist essentially of his novels, which he has himself classified as follows:—

Scenes from private life;—Scenes from provincial life;—Scenes from Parisian life;—Scenes from military life;—Scenes from country life;—Scenes from political life;—Philosophic studies;—and Analytical studies. Grouped together, these sub-divisions of his work form his Human Comedy.

Balzac's works further include the following plays: *Vautrin*, 1840;—*Les ressources de Quinola*, 1842;—*Paméla Giraud*, 1843;—*La marâtre*, 1848;—and *Le Faiseur* or *Mercadet* [1838, 1840], which, revised by M. d'Ennery, was first represented in 1851;

varied, a wider, and a more general order, on observation uninfluenced, as far as possible, by whatever is "personal" or individual in us: and by a coincidence it would be somewhat naïve to regard as a mere effect of chance, it happens that the rules of this observation are laid down precisely at the moment when the need is felt of opposing them to the systematic licence of Romanticism.

The rules in question are due to Auguste Comte. We shall not be expected to summarise here his *Cours de philosophie positive* (1831–1842), but it is essential to note that the main object of the founder of Positivism was to combat the assertion of the eclectic school to the effect that the Individual is judge of the truth or error contained in philosophic systems. The cases of Electicism

The *Contes drolatiques*, 1832, 1833, 1837;

His Miscellaneous Works, the collection of which is exceedingly incomplete; and his Correspondence.

There are two good editions of Balzac's works, the first in 20 volumes, Paris, 1855, Houssiaux;—and the second in 24 volumes, Paris, 1885, 1888, Calmann Lévy.

II.—**Jules Michelet** [Paris, 1798; † 1874, Hyères].

1. THE SOURCES.—A. Cochut, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January, 1842;—A. Nettement, *Histoire de la littérature sous le gouvernement de Juillet*, vol. ii., Paris, 1855;—H. Taine, *Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1855 and 1856;—É. Montégut, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February, 1857;—G. Monod, *Jules Michelet*, 1875 and 1897;—O. d'Haussonville, *Études biographiques et littéraires*, Paris, 1876;—F. Corréard, *Michelet* in the "Bibliothèque des Classiques populaires," 1886;—J. Simon, *Notice historique sur Michelet*, Paris, 1886;—É. Faguet, *Études littéraires sur le XIX. siècle*, Paris, 1887;—J. Brunhes, *Michelet*, Paris, 1898.

2. THE WRITER;—and that the reason we have not dealt with him earlier is that his influence, which has been most considerable [Cf. G. Monod, *loc. cit.*],—was restricted at first to a group of students,—and did not begin to make itself felt on the general public until towards 1845.—Proof of this assertion may be found in the fact that of all the great writers of his time,—he is, we believe, the only one of whom

and Romanticism are parallel: both have been ill understood—and combatted perhaps still more infelicitously—because both have, to a certain extent, been ill defined. In reality, both Victor Hugo and Victor Cousin were the most "personal" of men, and just as there is nothing but Hugo in the *Feuilles d'automne* or the *Voix intérieures*, so there is nothing but Cousin in his philosophy. If his work be read and reread, if the essence and object of his method be carefully examined and considered, nothing more will be found in his Eclecticism than the assertion of the right of Victor Cousin to cull from all philosophic systems what belongs to Victor Cousin, while his "observation of oneself by oneself" is merely an application of individualism to philosophy. The aim of Auguste Comte

Sainte-Beuve said nothing prior to 1862;—and even on this occasion [Cf. *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. ii.] he had less to say of Michelet than of Louis XIV. and the Duke of Burgundy.—Guizot, Mignet, and even Thiers were held in far greater esteem.—Taine was the first to do justice to Michelet;—placing him in the front rank of the poets, as well as of the writers of his time;—and his reputation thus started by Taine,—was definitely established by the issue of his books: *l'Oiseau*, 1856; *l'Insecte*, 1857; *l'Amour*, 1859; *la Femme*, 1860;—and of the concluding volumes of his *Histoire de France*, 1855–1867.

Michelet's humble birth;—his early difficulties;—his first literary efforts: his translation of the Works of Vico, and his *Précis d'histoire moderne*, 1827.—The first volumes of the *Histoire de France*, 1833–1844 [from the earliest times to the Renaissance];—and whether they should be regarded, as they are by some critics, as Michelet's masterpiece?—Remarks on this subject;—and that while he has other and more lyric qualities than Augustin Thierry,—the methods of the two writers are substantially analogous;—though Michelet's inspiration is the more Catholic or the less hostile to the Church.—It is surprising in consequence that Michelet's first volumes did not at once win him fame;—and that the Romanticists did not recognise him forthwith as one of the greatest amongst them.—At this juncture, however, his work induces him to forsake picturesque history in some measure,—for the philosophy of history;—a change of attitude that is observed simultaneously in his friend Quinet;—and his appointment to the was to demonstrate the narrowness and sterility of this "egoistic" method of observation. "The so-called psychological method, he wrote in his first Lesson, is radically null in its principle. . . . *Introspective observation*,—the italics are his,—gives rise to almost as many divergent opinions as there are individuals who fancy they exercise it. As to genuine men of science, they are still demanding in vain that a single real discovery be cited them that is due to this vaunted method." In consequence, the method he desired to substitute for that of Cousin, on the score of its being not merely the best, but in reality the only valuable method, was that which decrees our inability to attain to true self-knowledge, unless we begin by looking beyond ourselves, and

College of France, 1837,—results in both of them playing an active part in politics.

A second Michelet is now evolved from the first,—the Michelet of the *Jésuites*, 1843;—the author of the *Prêtre*, *de la femme*, *et de la famille*, 1845;—of the *Peuple*, 1846,—and of the *Histoire de la Révolution française*, 1847–1853.—At first sight there does not seem to be any great difference between this second Michelet,—and those of his contemporaries who are waging the same conflict;—while his early originality would seem to be lost amid the commonplace ideas he is developing with all the violence of an Encyclopædist.—There is, however, a something in him that his fellow combatants lack;—and in particular the faculty of making what he says and what he writes instinct with his personality.—He retires from his professorship at the College of France, 1852 [Cf. Jules Simon, *loc. cit.*, p. 219–221],—and from this date onwards, during the last twenty-five years of his life,—his reputation and his influence are at last equal to his merit.

He "discovers" "science";—natural history and physiology more particularly—and as he remains fundamentally "Romantic,"—he becomes the poet of science [Cf. *l'Oiseau*, *l'Insecte*, *la Femme*, *l'Amour*].—Astonishment of his contemporaries at seeing him mingle the most pronounced crudities of physiological realism and the extremest lyricism of Romantic mysticism.—He applies this method to history [Cf. his volume on the Renaissance and the Reformation];—and derives from it unexpected effects;—not the scrupulously set aside all personal bias when we attempt to systematise our observations. Far from our individuality being the standard by which we are to judge others, it is, on the contrary, our knowledge of our fellow-men that enables us to rectify the idea we form of ourselves. Properly speaking, we are merely the theatre or the scene of our impressions, and our originality is in general only an illustration of our vanity, a mirage, a phantasmagoria. True psychology is to be learned, not from the study of ourselves, but from the study of what is outside us and around us, of history and society. The connection which existed in the mind of Auguste Comte between the conception of "psychology" and what was said above of the progress of science in his time, will doubtless be

least considerable of which is to bring down, as it were, the conventional dignity of history,—to the level of life as we lead it ourselves.—His division of the reign of Francis I.: "Before the abscess and after the abscess";—and of the reign of Louis XIV.: "Before the fistula and after the fistula."—How closely this manner resembles, on the one hand, that of Victor Hugo;—and on the other that of Taine and Renan;—and that while it may have suggested to Michelet some singular ideas;—it nevertheless renewed history. Michelet did on a large scale,—what Sainte-Beuve did in detail in his *Causeries du lundi*,—a fact to which is due the attraction, the somewhat questionable attraction, of his *Louis XIV.* or his *Louis XV.*;—but which constitutes as well the danger of these works.

Michelet's last works, especially his *Bible de l'humanité*, 1864;—and the General Prefaces to his *Histoire de France* and his *Histoire de la Révolution*.—Return to his early symbolical and apocalyptic tendencies;—and, in this connection, of the resemblance between the closing phases of the intellectual evolution of Michelet and Victor Hugo [Cf. following article].—Analogy between their methods of expression;—and that both of them remained Romanticists to the end;—that is to say lyric writers, "democrats," and staunch spiritualists. — Michelet, however, has the greater measure of sensibility,—and having a less abundant command of words,—he has perhaps more sincerity.

Of Michelet's influence;—and that it has been considerable;—since, perceived. All that we can affirm with regard to our impressions is that we have experienced them; we cannot say that they are in conformity with their cause, or, in consequence, that we were right in experiencing them. Moreover, unless I am mistaken, the connection is not less clear between Comte's ideas and what is now termed "sociology."

A distinction is made at the present day between "Sociology" and "Socialism"; though we are as little certain of what constitutes the difference as we are of the true nature either of "Socialism" or of "Sociology." Towards 1840 these points were equally obscure, the very word "Socialism" being then but a barbarism of recent invention. Still, there was already

---

while favouring naturalism,—it has maintained, in opposition to naturalism, one of the traditions of idealism. For there has been no more fervent believer in progress than Michelet;—especially in moral progress;—as to the conditions of which he may indeed have been mistaken;—but to promote which he laboured with his whole soul;—and though particularly inclined to underestimate the difficulty of its realisation;—he would never allow the matter to be one to which a writer may remain indifferent.—Further, he worked harder than anybody at founding "the religion of the Revolution";—a task in which he has succeeded, whatever may be said to the contrary.—Finally, with all its defects,—defects inseparable perhaps from its qualities,—his "History of France" is the only work of the kind worthy of the name;—because he alone of all the historians who have attempted such a work,—possessed an imagination strong enough to enable him to "personalise" his country;—and thus lend its history something of that living interest which attaches to biography.—All other "Histories of France" are mere compilations.

3. THE WORKS.—Michelet's works may be divided into: (1) his Historical Works, comprising his *Histoire de France* [from the earliest times to the Renaissance], 1833–1844; and its continuation [from the Renaissance to the Revolution], 1855–1867;— his *Histoire de la Révolution*, 1847–1853;—and his *Histoire du XIX^e siècle* [posthumous];—his *Histoire romaine*, 1839;—and some miscellaneous writings, including the *Procès des Templiers*, 2 vols., in the collec-

an agreement, or, as it may perhaps be said, a conspiracy between all the thinkers of the period to denounce the excesses of individualism, and to extend beyond literature the war that was beginning to be waged on that doctrine. The Christian sociology of Bonald and de Maistre was seen to be giving rise to unexpected though logical consequences, which astonish even to-day both their adversaries and the disciples of Auguste Comte. Lamennais had written: "In any society whatever, self-renunciation is the primary condition of the existence of that society. . . . Human society is based on mutual concessions, on the sacrifice of one man to another, or of each man to all his fellows; for sacrifice is the essence of every true society. The evangelical doctrine of self-

tion of *Documents inédits de l'histoire de France*, 1851;—and his translations of Vico's works and of Luther's Table Talk.

(2) His Political or Polemical Works, the principal being: *Des Jésuites*, 1843;—*Le Prêtre la Femme et la Famille*, 1845; *le Temple*, 1846; and the *Cours professé au Collège de France*, 1848.

(3) His remaining works, which can be called neither "works of imagination" nor yet "scientific works": *l'Oiseau*, 1856; *l'Insecte*, 1857;—*l'Amour*, 1859;—*la Femme*, 1860;—*la Mer*, 1861;—*la Bible de l'humanité*, 1864;—*la Montagne*, 1868, etc.

Finally, certain posthumous works, the principal being: *Ma jeunesse*, 1884; *Mon Journal*, 1888;—*Sur les chemins de l'Europe*, 1893.

An edition in 40 volumes of Michelet's Complete Works [Paris, Flammarion] is at present in course of publication under the supervision of Mme Michelet. Begun some years back, this edition is now approaching completion.

III.—**Victor Marie Hugo** [Besançon, 1802; †1885, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Sainte-Beuve, *Premiers lundis*, i., 1827, iii., 1829, and *Portraits contemporains*, vol. i., 1831, 1832, 1835;—Gustave Planche's dramatic criticisms in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December, 1832, February, 1833, November, 1833; May, 1835; November and December, 1838;—A. Vinet, *Études sur la littérature française au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1851;—A. Nettement, *Littérature*

renunciation, so strange from the human point of view, is merely the proclamation of this great social law" [Cf. *Essai sur l'indifférence*, vol. i., chap. ii., 1817]. Moreover, when he abandoned Christianity, Lamennais did not abjure the doctrine of self-renunciation, but persevered with more ardour than ever in his great conflict with individualism. He converted George Sand to his way of thinking, and the author of *Lélia* now wrote: "Are there not misfortunes that call more urgently for relief than the boredom of this or the whims of that individual? The masses are faced by vital problems: abysses have been laid bare. Our tears, unable to fill them up, fall into them in vain. Amid sufferings so real and so profound, what interest can be aroused by the proud complaints of in-

française sous la Restauration et sous le gouvernement de Juillet, Paris, 1853;—Charles Baudelaire's very remarkable Notice in Crepet's *Recueil des poètes français*, Paris, 1862;—*Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*, Paris, 1863;—Edmond Biré, *Victor Hugo et la Restauration*, 1869; and *Victor Hugo avant 1830*, Paris, 1883; *Victor Hugo après 1830*, Paris, 1891; *Victor Hugo après 1852*, Paris, 1893 [five volumes which together form the most circumstantial but not the most impartial biography there is of Victor Hugo].

A. Asseline, *Victor Hugo intime*, Paris, 1885;—Leconte de Lisle and A. Dumas fils, *Discours prononcés pour la réception de M. Leconte de Lisle*, 1887;—Ernest Dupuy, *Victor Hugo, l'homme et le poète*, Paris, 1887; Émile Faguet, *XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1887;—G. Duval, *Dictionnaire des métaphores de Victor Hugo*, Paris, 1888;—G. Pellissier, *le Mouvement littéraire au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1889;—F. Brunetière, *l'Évolution de la Poésie lyrique au XIX^e siècle*, 1893–1895;—L. Mabilleau, *Victor Hugo*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, 1893;—Ch. Renouvier, *Victor Hugo*, Paris, 1889–1893.

2. THE MAN AND THE POET;—and of some interesting points of comparison between Voltaire and Victor Hugo;—not the least remarkable being the exceptional shrewdness and practical sense,—with which they looked after their material interests and regulated their lives.—Their longevity;—their fertility;—their universality,—moreover, are three reasons which contributed in both their cases to make them the

tellectual arrogance? The masses are hungry; let the geniuses not take it amiss that we should think of providing the people with bread before we turn our attention to erecting temples in their honour" [Cf. *Lettres à Marcie*, iii., 1837]. The movement did not stop here. Concern for "the boredom of this or the whims of that individual" had given place to "pity for the masses," and there now followed the organisation of this pity into a system, its development into a philosophy. "To live, is essentially to have humanity for object," wrote Pierre Leroux, and he explained his meaning in these terms: "Our existence is normal if it does not violate the bond that unites us to humanity. We ought to live in consequence as if we were to live eternally

greatest, though not the most original, "literary men" of their respective centuries. — Finally, they have at least two other characteristics in common:—both of them possessed in a supreme degree the gift of complying with the exigencies of the opinion of their time; —a fact that explains their variations;—and both owed their success in this direction to the same gift of "virtuosity,"—a gift which enabled them to appropriate the inventions or the ideas of their contemporaries,—with a view to transforming them and to giving them definite expression, the one in prose and the other in verse.—That this faculty of appropriation is perhaps one of the forms of genius itself;—and that in any case it seems to constitute the very definition of talent.

A. *Victor Hugo's early years.*—The poet's family and the Hugo's of Lorraine;—his mother a "Vendéenne";—and, in this connection, that the work entitled *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie* is almost as untrustworthy as the *Confessions* of J.-J. Rousseau [Cf. Biré, *Victor Hugo avant 1830*].—Hugo's early education: "With our victorious camps I wandered over vanquished Europe, I traversed the earth before traversing life!" [Cf. *Odes et Ballades: Mon enfance*; —*les Rayons et les Ombres: Ce qui se passait aux Feuillantines vers 1813*; *les Contemplations: Aux Feuillantines*];—and that the defects of this wandering education will leave their mark on the poet's work. —Hugo's first literary efforts;—his successes in prize competitions: at the French Academy, 1817, 1819;—and at the Floral Games, 1819, amongst humanity. And when we do not so live, we are wounded in eternal fashion in our present life, which amounts to saying that we suffer in our eternal life [Cf. *De l'humanité. Épilogue*, 1840]. These are the doctrines for which the word "Socialism" was at first the collective designation, and tradition indeed ascribes to Pierre Leroux the honour of having invented the term. Its vogue has since been great, and its meaning has undergone manifold corruptions, but at the outset it merely expressed the intention of opposing the excesses of individualism. So far as it was successful in this aim it did more than discredit the principle of Romanticism; it deprived it of its *raison d'être*, and rendered the very name synonymous with egoism or dilettantism.

1820.—Characteristics of these early productions;—and that if *Le Bonheur de l'étude* and *Les Avantages de l'enseignement* much resemble the work of Delille;—*Les Vierges de Verdun* or *Moïse sur le Nil* are merely an improvement on the work of Lebrun or Jean-Baptiste Rousseau.—The *Conservateur littéraire*;—and that the doctrines upheld in this publication by Victor Hugo and his brothers,—explain and justify its title.—The *Odes* of 1822.—The influence of Sir Walter Scott and the publication of *Han d'Islande*, 1823.—The second series of *Odes*, 1824, and that they show the influence of Vigny's *Poèmes antiques* [Cf. the *Chant du Cirque*, or the *Chant du Tournoi*];—and also the influence of Chateaubriand;—which is still more apparent in the *Odes et Ballades* of 1826;—and in the vehemence of Hugo's Royalist inspiration.—*Cromwell* and the preface to this play, 1827;—and how few ideas there are in it to which Stendhal or Mme de Staël had not given expression before Hugo.—Hugo's first relations with Sainte-Beuve, 1827;—and that the connection between "Romanticism" and the "classic" pleiad dates from them.—From them dates as well the importance Hugo will henceforth attach to the technical side of his art;—an importance at once observable in the *Orientales*, 1829 [Cf. in particular *Le Feu du ciel* and *les Djinns*];—in which volume indeed the poet seems to have wished to show Casimir Delavigne how he ought to have written the *Messéniennes*.—*Marion Delorme*, 1829;—*Hernani*, 1830;—*Notre-Dame de Paris*, 1831;—the *Feuilles d'automne*, 1831;—and that the *Feuilles*

It would not be difficult to show that history as well was inspired at this period by the same spirit. It would suffice to cite in proof Lamartine's *Histoire des Girondins*, which in 1847 was breeding revolt, so to speak; Michelet's *Révolution*; and Louis Blanc's *Révolution*, the first volumes of which belong to the same year. Should it be objected that these works are of too political an order,—though politics have thrown light on history more often than history has served as a guide to politics,—it would be enough to mention Mignet, Tocqueville, or Thiers himself, to recall the *Histoire du Consulat* or the *Histoire des négociations relatives à la succession d'Espagne*, 1835–1842. For it is abundantly clear from the works of these writers that if each of them has his personal conception of history, they

d'automne owe their inspiration to the *Méditations* and the *Confessions de J. Delorme* in as great a degree as the novel owes its very existence to Sir Walter Scott's *Quentin Durward*.

The Revolution of 1830;—the preface to *Marion Delorme*;—and that in celebrating in it "the three glorious days,"—Victor Hugo did not so much abjure his Royalist faith,—as obey the principle of his lyricism;—which is, and always will be, to go for inspiration to current events,—to be moved to song by all disasters as by all victories; —and to be as much as possible the sonorous echo of popular emotion. —That adopting this point of view, there is no occasion to distinguish between Hugo's dramatic and lyric work;—and the less so if the lyricism in his plays be now the only living element they contain.— The *Chants du crépuscule*, 1835.—His efforts to enter the Academy, 1836-1840; the *Voix intérieures*, 1837;—the *Rayons et les Ombres*, 1840.—Victor Hugo becomes the recognised poet of "Bonapartism"; —though in adopting this attitude he merely associates himself with a new movement of French "national thought";—which inspires him some of his finest verses.—He enters the French Academy, 1841; —and Louis Philippe's Government consoles him for the failure of the *Burgraves*, 1843,—by making him a Peer of France, 1845.

B. *Victor Hugo's three manners*;—and in the first place, that their succession was far less "willed" by the poet,—than determined by an interior force of which he never rendered himself entirely the master; —by the movement of ideas of his time;—and by circumstances.

all of them firmly believe that there exists an historic certitude, a truth it is possible to attain to; a truth, too, which, while it doubtless is not necessarily contrary to the impressions we receive from facts, may happen not to be in conformity with them. It is even in the name of this truth that they contradict and combat each other, that one after the other they rewrite the history of the Revolution each as he conceives it. They are conscious that they are men, and subject as such to error; that they are imbued with prejudices derived from their birth, their education, or the nature at the moment of their interests. The very object of their method, however, is to rid themselves of their prejudices or to guard themselves against error, and they pride themselves on being,

---

1. *The lyric inspiration*;—and that even in his first volume, the *Odes* of 1822,—beneath a declamatory and old-fashioned phraseology,—his lyricism is recognisable in the already personal, energetic, and combative character of his verse.—That the *Orientales* do not belie this character;—since the descriptions which are their glory;—and the finest perhaps in the French language,—do not correspond to anything the poet has seen with his own eyes;—whether in the case of his Egypt [*le Feu du ciel*], of his Turkey [*les Têtes du Sérail*], or of his Russia [*Mazeppa*];—and are in consequence purely subjective.—The same characteristics are still more clearly discernible in the *Feuilles d'automne*;—all the pieces in which, as Goethe has remarked, are merely "occasional pieces" [Cf. *Rêverie d'un passant à propos d'un Roi*, or *Dicté en présence du glacier du Rhône*];—and admissions or confessions of the poet, who, though he does not as yet descend into "the dreary depths of the gulf within,"—nevertheless confides to us his loves, his memories and his regrets [Cf. *Que t'importe, ô mon cœur*, and *O mes lettres d'amour*].—The *Chants du crépuscule*, too, are full of his personality.—It is observable, however, that his lyricism is less personal in this volume as regards the matter than as regards the manner,—doubtless because the poet is conscious that the very magnificence of his verse makes it unsuited for the direct expression of personal details,—or because he no longer finds in such details sufficiently rich material for his "virtuosity."—The same tendency is still more clearly seen in the *Voix intérieures* or in the *Rayons et*

one is tempted to say they make it a point of professional vanity to be, the mere impartial registrars of the past. Here again, then, by a different channel, truth is being readmitted into art; or, to express the situation better, and in terms that do not lend themselves to confusion, the artist is subordinating himself to his subject instead of claiming to dominate it. Thiers, when he is relating the battle of Marengo, never imagines for an instant that it is in him, Thiers, that the reader is interested, any more than Tocqueville indulges in self-exhibition when he attempts to descry the future of democracy. The facts speak, or ought to speak, in their place, so that with these writers history, falling into line with sociology, philosophy, and science, sides against Romanticism.

les Ombres;—two of his finest collections of lyrics.—In these works his first manner attains to its final and definite expression.—"His soul . . . which the God whom he worships placed in the centre of all things like a sonorous echo," responds within him to the songs, the murmurs, and the tears of the universe.—He now "scores" these utterances, as a musician might;—that is he sustains, develops, and amplifies their strains;—by the resources of a harmony which is the outcome of the combined promptings of nature, history, and passion [Cf. *Sunt lacrimæ rerum*;—*A l'Arc de triomphe*;—*Fonction du Poète*;—*Tristesse d'Olympio*].—And it is for this reason, that if there be elegies more touching than his, as are those of Lamartine;—or more despairing songs, as are certain of those of Musset,—there are none more "lyric," or that comply more closely with the very definition of this branch of poetry;—in virtue of the very nature of their primary inspiration;—of the spaciousness, the magnificence, and the diversity of the "movements" which the poet finds to express his inspiration;—and finally in virtue of the "impersonal," general, and external element he already introduces into his work.

2. *The epic-satirical inspiration*;—and that if Victor Hugo had already risen superior in the *Rayons et les Ombres* to the admixture of egoism that is sometimes present in pure lyricism;—so far as it is personal;—politics themselves;—and exile;—and solitude;—though they had not detached him from his own personality,—had nevertheless still further enlarged his conception of his art;—and given his

Criticism, moreover, weary of the humiliating rôle to which it has been subjected for a score of years, follows suit. Sainte-Beuve himself, the former admirer, disciple, and, as Heinrich Heine wittily termed him, "impresario" of Hugo, is in revolt; and his *Port-Royal*, which begins to appear in 1840, his *Chateaubriand*, the date of which is 1848, and his *Causeries du lundi*, which are started in 1849, breathe an exactly contrary spirit to his *Portraits contemporains.* I do not refer to his recantations! For all of them he is not to be held responsible, since although he has doubtless changed in the interval between the *Méditations* and *Raphaël* and *Graziella*, Lamartine has changed still more! It is more particularly his method, and with his method the object

originality its definite characteristics.—The *Châtiments*, 1852;—and that while the volume does little honour to Hugo's character;—it contains some of his masterpieces [Cf. *l'Obéissance passive*; *Toulon*; *l'Expiation*];—pieces in which not only is the relationship between satire and lyricism even more apparent than in the work of the indignant poet of the *Iambes*;—but in which the transition is detected as well from the lyric to the epic manner.—At first sight these features seem less observable in the *Contemplations*, 1856;—but it has to be noted that although the *Contemplations* were not published until 1856;—an entire volume of them was written prior to 1848 [Cf. in particular *A Villequier*, and all the pieces relating to the death of his daughter];—while such pieces as *Horror* or *Les Mages* already constitute a link between the poet's second and third manner.—On the other hand the *Légende des siècles*, 1859,—is entirely characteristic of his second manner;—which although still lyric or satirical [Cf. the opening portion of *La Rose de l'Infante*];—so far as it shows Hugo not to have forgotten his grudges or his hatreds;—is rather epic;—if, for example, it does not appear that the poet had any other reason for writing his *Booz endormi*,—and some other pieces of a like nature,—than the temptation to realise in them his vision of past times.—He does not describe for the sake of describing;—but the things he describes interest him in themselves *for what they are*;—and *because they* are;—and finally *such as they were.*—He even concerns himself with things that do not interest him personally at all;—an attitude of his criticism, that has undergone a transformation. He now proceeds on the lines of the natural historian, or he even dabbles in physiology, and henceforth, when his private grudges or his vanity are not at stake, he does not claim for his impressions that they are his own, but that they are in accordance with the truth.

He goes a step further, and coming to the conclusion that in literature or art the distinctions between the different branches and the hierarchy of talents are not perhaps "what a vain populace thinks," he discerns the permanent reason and the primary cause of this fact in the diversity of the various "families of intellects." Who is it has said that "life which is a tragedy for those who feel, is a comedy for those who think?" This being

which would accord with the very definition of epic description;—if it were not that, as when writing the *Orientales*, Hugo remains too indifferent to the "absolute truth" of these things;—and continues to represent them such as he imagines them;—without even being in doubt as to the infallibility of his imagination.—His attitude in these respects is the same in the *Chansons des Rues et des Bois*, 1865;—which are a return to lyricism as regards the often boundless caprice or "frolicsomeness" of their inspiration;—the variety of their execution;—and the liberty he takes in them neither to accept nor respect any restraint.

3. *The apocalyptic inspiration.*—Solitary meditation, however, had had another effect on the poet;—an effect it is attempted to convey in speaking of his "apocalyptic" manner.—Scarcely any other word conveys the furious desire to "vaticinate" that takes possession of him;—the deepening of the shadow in his work;—from which the rays of light gleam forth, as from a picture by Rembrandt, with all the more startling brilliancy;—and the way in which he is haunted by the "unfathomable."—These are the characteristics of the second *Légende des siècles*, 1877;—and of the third, 1883.—To express the element of hostility that resides in the nature which surrounds and defies us;—to express the still greater horror of annihilation;—to raise up terrifying visions before the mind's eye [Cf. *l'Épopée du Ver*; *Pleurs dans la nuit*; *la Trompette du jugement*], the poet now discovers unknown images and accents;—he reminds the reader of an

the case, we are confronted at once with two clearly separated classes, with two "families of intellects"—it might almost be said with two sexes. For will not a woman always prefer *Andromaque* to the *Misanthrope*, *Zaïre* to the *Barbier de Séville* (I mean Beaumarchais' work) or *Hernani* to *Tragaldabas*? But if there are families of intellects, which themselves are subdivided into genera, species, and orders, does it not follow that neither our impressions nor our judgments are of any value in criticism? Whether the critic blames or praises, approves or condemns, it is not the sentence or even the judge that is of importance, but solely the reasons on which the verdict is based. Further,

Æschylus or an Isaiah ;—and he turns his very obscurity to account as a means of producing effect.—Here, however, the truth is seen of the famous saying that "between the sublime and the ridiculous there is only a step" ;—and Hugo oversteps this narrow borderline in *le Pape* ;—*l'Ane* ;--*Religions et Religion* ; 1878–1880 ; works which are unreadable ;—whose obscurity is no longer even that behind which we search for a meaning ;—they are works which do not even procure us the sensation of vastness or giganticness ;—but that of emptiness —works whose only originality, if originality it be, is that they are "frantically commonplace."—The reason of this latter qualification will shortly appear ;—when it has been shown in how great a degree the commonplace nature of certain of Hugo's ideas contributed to his popularity.—It must further be pointed out that the succession of the poet's three manners must not be interpreted too rigidly ;—since even in *l'Ane* there are traces of the poet of the *Orientales*,—just as in the author of the *Feuilles d'automne* there are the beginnings of that of *Religions et Religion*.

C. *The last years of Victor Hugo* ;—and of the very great political and social influence he exerted,—not as a Peer of France ;—or as a member of the Assemblies of 1848 and 1850 ;—but as a writer ;—by his *Châtiments*, 1852 ;—by his *Napoléon le Petit*, 1853 ;—by his *Misérables*, 1862 ;—or in other words by the persistence of his hatreds ;—and the perhaps unconscious skill with which he identified them with the cause of "social progress."—The *Misérables* ;—and that originally the work was doubtless the outcome of a desire to surpass on what does the value of these reasons depend if not on the knowledge we possess—or are capable of possessing—of the laws which govern the human mind? The glory of Sainte-Beuve lies in his having had a presentiment of this simple truth, though he did not always have the courage to apply it. But for the moment the presentiment is sufficient, for others than Sainte-Beuve were shortly to expand it into an entirely new conception of criticism; and thus it came about that the author of the *Confessions de Joseph Delorme*, who had been one of the stoutest supporters of budding Romanticism, became in his maturity, as the author of the *Causeries du lundi*, its most redoubtable antagonist.

in popularity the masters of the popular newspaper "novel";—the author of the *Mémoires du Diable*, or that of the *Mystères de Paris*. —Of the spirit in which the *Misérables* is written;—of the art with which the worst popular prejudices are flattered in it;—and, in this connection, that if Victor Hugo is not what is called a "thinker,"—his ideas nevertheless have more significance than is usually attributed to them.—*William Shakespeare*, 1864;—and that in connection with more than one point criticism has nothing better to offer than some of Hugo's literary judgments or intuitions.—The *Travailleurs de la Mer*, 1866;—and that there is "depth" in the book in places;—as indeed is natural enough;—since when a writer possesses, to the degree in which Hugo did, the gift of "verbal invention,"—it is impossible that he should diversely associate words,—without diversely associating as well the ideas they express.—It is impossible, too, to treat the "commonplace,"—without touching on the most general questions that interest humanity;—for example, it is impossible for a writer of Hugo's calibre to develop the ideas contained in such words as "independence," "liberty," or "fatherland,"—without bringing new aspects of things into evidence [Cf. *Quatre-vingt-Treize*].—Finally, when a writer's thoughts do no more than follow the current of general opinion,—the thoughts he expresses profit by the authority of all those who have assimilated them.—A clear example of this is afforded by the poem *Religions et Religion*, 1880;—which at bottom is merely a popular expression;—a less subtle but sufficiently accurate expression of the opinion of a Schleiermacher, or a Renan;—to the

III

It would perhaps be stretching a point to include as well among the adversaries of Romanticism either the author of the *Destinées*, 1843–1863, or that of *Émaux et Camées*, 1852. However, they may truthfully be termed deserters from the declining school. Nothing was wanting in the first of the two to make him the greatest of French poets but certain of the defects of the second: the latter's inexhaustible wealth of verbal invention, his constant striving after the "picturesque" and his virtuosity. Be it added that good judges had divined his talent almost at the outset of his career: "Buchez and

---

effect that all "positive" religions are mere limitations;—or deformations;—or corruptions of the universal religion.

> Il est ! Mais nul cri d'ange ou d'homme, nul effroi,
> Nul amour, nulle bouche, humble, ou tendre ou superbe,
> Ne peut distinctement balbutier ce verbe !
> Il est ! Il est ! Il est ! Il est éperdument.

The foregoing remark brings us back to our comparison between Victor Hugo's rôle and that of Voltaire;—and without insisting on that "Deism";—the fortunes of which both of them imagined they would establish the more solidly,—in proportion as they maltreated positive religions,—three great differences are discerned between the two rôles.—The first is all to the advantage of Hugo, who is the most "extraordinary" of French lyric poets;—and who in his masterpieces shows himself the greatest writer of verse France possessed;—while Voltaire has many superiors among French prose writers.—On the other hand, Voltaire possesses two qualities which Victor Hugo lacked:—a wide, varied, and substantial culture which even borders in some departments on erudition; — and, secondly, he was indifferent to none of the manifestations of the spirit of his time;—whereas Victor Hugo's curiosity was never excited in the least degree by the "scientific" and philosophic movement of his period.—And it is perhaps in this respect that he is a poet;—if all great poets have had their attention fixed in a general way on the past;—but it is also for this reason that while he apparently filled the same rôle as Voltaire, his friends, relates Sainte-Beuve, had noted among the Romantic school the commanding personality of M. de Vigny and had endeavoured to recruit him." The critic goes on to say that de Vigny declined these advances,—he being too proud, and rightly too proud, ever to belong to any other school than his own,—"but from this moment he was brought to occupy himself with certain social questions to a greater extent than he had done hitherto" [Cf. *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. vi., p. 420]. And the fact is that the Romantic element which is still to be found in *Stello*, 1832, and *Chatterton*, 1835, has greatly diminished in *Grandeur et Servitude militaires*, while mere traces of it are all that subsist in the *Sauvage*,

---

—he is not in an equal degree with Voltaire the "personification" of his time.

3. The Works.—Victor Hugo's works are easy to classify, and overlooking his quite youthful productions which he disregarded himself, comprise:

His *Poems*: *Odes et Ballades*, 1822, 1824, 1826, 1828;—the *Orientales*, 1829;—*Feuilles d'automne*, 1831;—the *Chants du crépuscule*, 1835;—the *Voix intérieures*, 1837;—the *Rayons et les Ombres*, 1840;—the *Châtiments*, 1852;—the *Contemplations*, 1856;—the *Légende des siècles* [in three parts], 1859, 1877, 1883;—the *Chansons des Rues et des Bois*, 1865;—*l'Année terrible*, 1871;—*l'Art d'être grand-père*, 1877;—*le Pape*, 1878;—*la Pitié suprême*, 1879;—*l'Ane*, 1880;—*Religions et Religion*, 1880;—the *Quatre Vents de l'esprit*, 1881;—the *Théâtre en liberté*, 1884.

His *Plays* [Cf. above: The Romantic Drama].

His *Novels*: *Bug Jargal*, 1818, 1826;—*Han d'Islande*, 1823;—*le Dernier jour d'un condamné*, 1829;—*Notre-Dame de Paris*, 1831;—*Claude Gueux*, 1834;—the *Misérables*, 1862;—the *Travailleurs de la Mer*, 1866;—*l'Homme qui rit*, 1869;—and *Quatre-vingt-Treize*, 1874.

His *Political Works*:—*Étude sur Mirabeau*, 1834;—*Napoléon le Petit*, 1852;—*Histoire d'un Crime*, 1852–1877;—and the four volumes entitled *Avant l'Exil*; *Pendant l'Exil*; and *Depuis l'Exil.*

Finally: *Littérature et philosophie mêlées*, 1834;—*le Rhin*, 1842; *William Shakespeare*, 1864;—*l'Archipel de la Manche*, 1884.

the *Mort du loup*, 1843, the *Maison du berger*, 1844, and the *Bouteille à la mer*, 1854. Is it for this reason that Sainte-Beuve, for his part, declares that these works show "a decline"? It is the exact contrary that is true. Vigny has left no finer verses, no verses more typical of his genius, or which give a nobler idea of the poet. The *Mort du loup*:

> Seul le silence est grand, tout le reste est faiblesse ;

the *Maison du berger*:

> J'aime la majesté des souffrances humaines ;

the *Bouteille à la mer*:

> Le vrai Dieu, le Dieu fort est le Dieu des idées ;

Since Hugo's death, eight or nine volumes of posthumous works and two volumes of his Correspondence have been published.

His Complete Works—less the Correspondence—have been issued in 56 volumes, in 8vo, Paris, 1885–1892, Hetzel.

IV.—**George Sand (Amantine—Lucile—Aurore Dupin, Baroness Dudevant),** [Nohant, 1804; † 1876, Nohant].

1. The Sources.—George Sand, *Histoire de ma vie*, 1854–1855; and *Correspondance*, 1882–1884 [Cf. her early novels, *Indiana*, *Valentine*, and later, *Elle et Lui*].

Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. i., 1832, 1833; and *Causeries du lundi*, vol. i., 1850;—Gustave Planche, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for December, 1832, August, 1833, and October, 1834;—Comte T. Walsh, *George Sand*, Paris, 1837;—A. Vinet, *Études sur la littérature française au XIX^e siècle*, article written in connection with the preceding book;—Lerminier in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1844;—Charles de Mazade, *ibid.*, May, 1857;—O. d'Haussonville, *Études biographiques et littéraires*, Paris, 1879;—Caro, *George Sand*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, 1887;—Émile Faguet, *XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1887;—F. Brunetière, *Évolution de la Poésie lyrique*, 1893.

2. The Writer;—and in the first place of the threefold contrast afforded by the regularity of her production and the irregularity of her existence;—the delicate brilliancy of her imagination and the violence of some of the opinions she championed;—and the impersonal

are strewn with lines which haunt our memories. The sturdy admonition he opposed to the lamentations with which the Romanticists had wearied their contemporaries: "to complain, to weep, to pray, is equally cowardly," has more especially been hearkened to. Finally, by means of the symbol, which he restored to its original use,—the expression, that is, of the relationship, no less certain than obscure, between the pure idea and plastic form,—all these pieces, or rather all these poems, brought back poetry to a consciousness of its object and of its social function. "I am merely a sort of epic moralist," he has said of himself [Cf. *Journal d'un poète*, 1834], and it would be impossible to describe him better, or to

character of her style and the individualist inspiration of her early novels.

Extraction, family, and education of Aurore Dupin [Cf. *Histoire de ma vie*] ;—her marriage;—her first Letters [Cf. in particular letter dated Bagnères, 28 August, 1825].—Her separation from her husband [Cf. Letter of December 3, 1830, and *Indiana*];—her residence in Paris and her first literary efforts.—Henri de Latouche and Jules Sandeau.—*Rose et Blanche*, 1831;—*Indiana*, 1831;—*Valentine*, 1832; —*Lélia*, 1833;—*Jacques*, 1834;—and that the originality of these works is not so much that they proclaimed the "divine right" of passion,—as that in consequence, amongst other merits [*Rose et Blanche* must be excepted] of the freshness and poetic truth of the background;—the "bourgeois" and in particular the real character of the plot;—and the fluent and copious style;—they definitely made of the novel a form of literature "capable of being the vehicle of thought."—This had not been done since the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, 1761, and since *Corinne*, 1807.—But *Corinne* was placed amid unusual conditions;—and Rousseau's novel offered, properly speaking, no fictional "interest,"—while there is such an interest both in *Valentine* and *Indiana*;—and whatever the social situation of George Sand's heroines may be, there is at least nothing extraordinary about their adventures.—Can as much be said of their sentiments;—and in particular of those which find expression in *Jacques* and *Lélia*?—If as much cannot be said,—if, on the contrary, these works ought to be called personal or "lyric" novels,—it results that it is for this determine better how and in what respect his influence, to begin with, parted company with that of the Romanticists, and ended by triumphing over it.

He had also said: "A book, as I conceive it, ought to be composed, sculptured, gilded, cut, finished and filed and polished like a statue of Parian marble," and it must be admitted that he has fallen too short, in his finest poems, of this artistic ambition. The honour of realising it was to belong to a writer who is still sometimes regarded as the most uncompromising of Romanticists, who was so in 1830, but who did not remain so, and who, on the contrary, merely by the manner in which he transformed the art of descriptive writing, might alone and

---

reason that they are Romantic,—or even Byronian.—It should be added that since their Romanticism is unaccompanied by an exotic background,—and since they deal with contemporary life;—they are Romantic in a different way from *Cinq-Mars* or *Notre-Dame de Paris*,—and the combination of all these circumstances sufficiently explains,—to say nothing of the author's sex,—how it was that two novels, *Indiana* and *Valentine*, should have been enough to render the name of George Sand illustrious in two years;—a name rendered famous a year later by *Lélia*;—and more famous still the following year by what may be termed the adventure of the "loves of Venise."

Of a saying of the Duchesse de Bourgogne to the effect that "under the reign of women it is the men who govern";—and how signally it is borne out by the literary life of George Sand;—if from *Mauprat*, 1837, down to the publication of the *Histoire de ma vie*, 1854–1855,—the key to the history of her work is furnished by her masculine friendships.—The fact is, that for some fifteen or sixteen years her "virtuosity,"—very different from that of Hugo,—exercised itself almost exclusively in giving artistic shape,—to the ideas which were suggested to her.—The influence of Lamennais and the *Lettres à Marcie*; *Spiridion*; *les Sept cordes de la lyre*, 1839.—The influence of Pierre Leroux and the socialist or humanitarian novels: the *Compagnon du tour de France*, 1840, the *Péché de Monsieur Antoine*, 1845.—The influence of Chopin and of Liszt: *Consuelo*, 1842–1843.—The influence of freemasonry: the *Comtesse de Rudolstadt*, 1844.—The influence of Barbès and George Sand's rôle in the unaided have evolved out of Romanticism the naturalistic doctrines it contained in a dormant state. "I have been to Constantinople," Théophile Gautier has said, "to be a Mussulman at my ease; to Greece, for the Parthenon and Phideas; to Russia, for the snow and Byzantine art; to Venice, for Saint Mark and the palace of the Doges" [Cf. Bergerat, *Théophile Gautier*, pp. 126, 127]. Is it not clear that Gautier, when he ceases thus to be a mere traveller or tourist, and constitutes himself the historian or the painter of the countries he traverses, adopts an attitude which amounts to a resolve to put aside his personality, so as to leave himself free to receive the impressions the places he visits will make on him?

---

revolution of 1848.—Still, amid the conflicting action of these various influences,—she is mindful of her native district of Berri;—and she retains her love of nature;—and her taste for peasant manners [Cf. *La mare au diable*, 1846; *La petite Fadette*, 1849; *François le Champi*, 1850].—And the success of these novels,—on the morrow of the adventures of the Revolution,—has a twofold result:—it reconciles her with the general public;—on whom she had seemed disposed to turn her back with a view to addressing herself exclusively to the "populace",—while the general public, coming to regard her as a great talent reclaimed from party spirit, is reconciled with her in turn.

For her part she profited in two ways by her connection with socialism:—in the first place she was brought to perceive the danger of "individualism";—and in the second place to understand that the world is vaster than the little we can learn of it by our personal experience would lead us to suppose.—We are not the only human beings, and our ills are not the sum total of ills;—there are other and more cruel misfortunes than to have made a loveless marriage like Valentine;—or than to have found, like Lélia, that pleasure ends in disgust. —Hence the new character of the novels of her last period;—with the exception of *Elle et Lui*, 1859, which is her rather tardy answer to the *Confession d'un Enfant du siècle.—Jean de la Roche*, 1860; —the *Marquis de Villemer*, 1861;—*Tamaris*, 1862;—*Mlle de la Quintinie*, 1863 [a rejoinder to Octave Feuillet's *Histoire de Sibylle*]. —She does not abjure her ideas;—she is always ready to plead what she believes to be the cause of liberty;—she is opposed to all moral

Neither Musset nor Hugo would have been capable of this self-suppression. Moreover, as it is impossible for any brain to convert itself naturally, spontaneously, into a "photographic dark-room," as it were, the principle has for consequence that we shall begin by arranging to keep our impressions as far as possible from the influence of our personality—an attitude directly opposed to that of the Romanticists. Moreover, as the only chance of this effort being successful lies in our exercising perpetual attention in the choice of the means we shall employ to express our impressions, there results a constant and scrupulous regard for style, an anxious vigilance in the matter, which the Romanticists were

---

or political restraint;—but the ardour of her apostolate abates;—and still more the ardour of her faith in revolt.—*Antonia*, 1863;—the *Confession d'une jeune fille*, 1865;—*Monsieur Silvestre*, 1866;—*Le Dernier Amour*, 1867;—*Mlle Merquem*, 1868.—If she does not apply herself to making her imagination "subservient" to her models;—she nevertheless introduces much less of herself into her depictions of them;—and her interest is centred in the lifelike air,—if not in the reality she lends them [Cf. her correspondence with Flaubert, and below the article FLAUBERT].—She experiences vaguely the retrospective influence of the daily growing popularity of Balzac;—and of that "realism" which she helped to bring into existence.—Her last works: *Francia*, 1871;—*Nanon*, 1872;—*Flamarande*, 1875;—the *Tour de Percemont*, 1876.—If we do not allude to her plays, the reason is that they can scarcely be said to be her work;—the rare successes she met with on the stage,—being due to the technical skill of those who collaborated with her.

Of the main defect of George Sand's novels;—and that apart from the naïve immorality of certain of them;—it lies in the fact that while they have a realistic starting-point;—they all of them fall away into vagueness as they continue or before they are concluded.—This feature may be expressed in other terms;—and in such a way as to include both the good and the bad qualities;—by saying that from *Indiana* to the *Marquis de Villemer*,—all George Sand's novels are poems in prose,—rather than studies of manners;—and it must be added: "improvised" poems in prose.

also without, at which, indeed, they had been a little inclined to scoff [Cf. Lamartine, *Lettre à M. Léon Bruys d'Ouilly*; and Musset, *Après une lecture*], and the absence of which carries with it the penalty that even their masterpieces have a certain air of negligence or improvisation. With the author of *Émaux et Camées* a generation of artists succeeds a generation of improvisators. To his name might be joined that of Théodore de Banville, in virtue of his *Cariatides*, 1842, his *Stalactites*, 1846, and his *Odelettes*, 1856, were it not that too often the art in these works leaves the impression that it has been achieved for the sake of amusement or even of a wager, and further that the author of the *Odes funam-*

3. The Works.—George Sand's principal novels have been mentioned in the course of the above notice.—Her complete works form over a hundred volumes [Michel Lévy's edition];—not including the four volumes of the *Histoire de ma vie*;—and the six volumes that have appeared up to now of her Correspondence.

V. **Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve** [Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1804; † 1869, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Sainte-Beuve's own works: *Portraits contemporains*, vol. ii.;—*Portraits littéraires*, vol. ii.;—*Causeries du lundi*, vol. xi.;—and the index volume of the *Causeries*;—*Nouveaux lundis*, vol. xiii.;—*Lettres à la Princesse*;—and his Correspondence.

Gustave Planche, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, September, 1851;—Cuvillier-Fleury, *Études historiques et littéraires*, 1854;—Alfred Michiels, *Histoire des idées littéraires en France au XIX^{e} siècle*, 1843, 1848, 1861, 1864.

J. Levallois, *Sainte-Beuve*, 1872;—Pons, *Sainte-Beuve et ses inconnues*, 1879;—J. Troubat, *Souvenirs du dernier secrétaire de Sainte-Beuve*, 1890.

O. d'Haussonville, *Sainte-Beuve, sa vie et ses œuvres*, 1875;—F. Brunetière, *l'Évolution des genres*, vol. i., 1889;—and *l'Évolution de la poésie lyrique*, vol. i., 1894;—Émile Faguet, *Sainte-Beuve*, in the *Revue de Paris*, February, 1897.

2. The Writer.—His extraction;—and that it would be useless to note that he was born at Boulogne-sur-Mer,—if the circumstance had

bulesques, 1857, too frequently seems to be making fun of his subject, his public, and himself.

If all these influences be considered together, it is not surprising that towards 1850,—between 1848 and 1855— the reaction already started against Romanticism should continue and be crowned with success in every branch of literature simultaneously. The politics of Romanticism, of which the Revolution of 1848 was the bankruptcy, are attacked at the same time as its ethics and its æsthetics. The *Châtiments*, indeed, are applauded because, side by side with nameless scurrility, they contain some of Hugo's finest verses; but for various reasons some of them political and others, more numerous, literary,

---

not procured him the patronage of Daunou,—who belonged to the same town;—whose conversations imbued him with the spirit of the eighteenth century;—to whose influence he perhaps owed his admission to the staff of the *Globe*, 1824;—and on whose advice it was that he wrote his first work: the *Tableau de la poésie française au XVI siècle*, 1827–1828.

A. *The Poet*;—and his rôle in the Romantic revolution.—He contrived, by connecting Romanticism with the Pleiad and Andre Chénier,—to provide the innovators with a long line of ancestors;— less illustrious, but dating further back than those claimed by the pseudo-Classicists.—Having recognised in Ronsard [Cf. above the article RONSARD],—the greatest inventor of rhythms and the craftsman who had handled them most skilfully in French literature,—he taught the Romanticists in general,—and Victor Hugo in particular, —the power and virtue of form [Cf. the celebrated piece:

Rime, qui donnes leurs sons
Aux chansons . . .

—or again, in the *Pensées d'août*, the *Épître á Villemain*].—Later, in the *Confessions de Joseph Delorme*, 1829;—and in his *Consolations*, 1831,—he carried lyricism,—so far as it is the expression of the personality of the poet,—to positively morbid lengths;—and in this respect he was one of the forerunners of Baudelaire.—Finally in the *Pensées d'août*, 1837,—as if convinced that lyricism thus conceived could only last for a limited time,—finding that he had nothing left of interest to it occurs to nobody to imitate them. The prodigious facility of the poet resembles incontinence, and the torrent of his invention assuredly bears along in its course more words or sounds than ideas! To the "unappreciated woman" of the novels of George Sand,—who herself is reverting to the peasant heroines of the *Mare au diable* or *La Petite Fadette*,—or of her imitators, the school "of good sense" is opposing the bourgeois comedies of Camille Doucet and Augier. The courtesan is stripped of the poetic halo with which Romanticism had endowed her, and in the place of Marion Delorme or of Lélia she becomes Marguerite Gautier [Cf. the *Dame aux Camélias*, 1852], Suzanne d'Ange [Cf. the *Demi-Monde*, 1855], or

say in verse,—he wrote poetry which is merely rather poor prose;—but which nevertheless acclimatised in contemporary French poetry a taste for the insignificant;—and sympathy with the mediocre.

B. *The Critic.*

1. *From 1824 to 1837.*—This is the period of the *Portraits littéraires* and of the *Portraits contemporains*;—a militant and active period,—during which, when his criticism does not serve him as a means to satisfy his grudges;—and to rank the authors he treats with a view to the position to which he himself pretends as a poet;—it is little else than the diary of his personal impressions;—and in this sense purely Romantic.—The nature, however, of his impressions seems to indicate that he is already primarily concerned with learning the conditions under which the works he deals with were written;—while satisfaction at pointing out their defects;—the desire to judge them;—or even the pleasure of enjoying them,—are but secondary considerations with him;—and thus it comes about that from a purely subjective criticism,—there is evolved and there is already disengaged,—a psychological criticism,—whose tendency is to subordinate the study or examination of the "works" to a knowledge of their "authors";—and of their mode of life.—Novelty at the time of this style of criticism;—and that it was not without analogy with the nature of the investigations which Balzac was declaring to be the object of the novelist's art;—a fact which is perhaps the explanation of the bitter hostility between the two writers—*Rara concordia fratrum*!—fraternal feuds being especially common in

Olympe Taverny [Cf. the *Mariage d'Olympe*]. A not less significant example is that of a young writer [Octave Feuillet] who, after beginning his career, towards 1845, under the auspices of Romanticism, parts company little by little with his masters, and leaving them discreetly, without fuss or hubbub, in a word politely, starts in *Le Village*, 1852, in *Dalila*, 1853, in the *Petite Comtesse*, 1856, a campaign he will continue until his death, no longer merely against the courtesan, but against "passion" itself.

In the meantime, from the solitary retreat where he is toiling at the most laborious of masterpieces, another writer reviews the glories of Romanticism, according his

literature;—and nothing separating men more profoundly than the circumstance that they are employing opposite means to compass the same end.—And the fact is that, in spite of differences, Balzac's novels and Saint-Beuve's criticism are marked by the same kind of "indiscretion";—the same "anatomical" treatment or the same "dissection" of the "subjects";—the same calm audacity;—while, finally, they produce the same lifelike effects.—Comparison, in this respect, between the criticism of Villemain and the criticism of Sainte-Beuve;—and how much more abstract, more unsubstantial, less keen and less penetrating the first is than the second.

2. *From 1837 to 1850;*—or from the lectures delivered at Lausanne on the Port-Royal, to those at Liège on Chateaubriand and his literary group.—This is the really fruitful period;—that in which a reconciliation is effected in Sainte-Beuve's criticism, freed from the trammels of Romanticism,—between the criticism which "feels" and the criticism which "explains";—through the medium of a deeper and more exact knowledge of history.—The *Port-Royal*, and of its importance in this respect.—How its author pays simultaneous attention to three matters:—examination of works;—analysis of sentiments;—and appreciation or judgment of ideas [Cf. in particular the chapters devoted to Pascal].—How three qualities are combined to their mutual strengthening in the work:—the precision of the historian;—the subtilty of the psychologist;—the decision of the judge [Cf. in particular the chapters on Montaigne, Saint François de Sales, Corneille and Boileau].—And how, from the example thus given, there

approval to none of them with the exception of Hugo, complaining that Lamartine writes badly, blaming Musset for having believed "neither in himself, nor in his art, but in his passions," mocking at his "dandyism," and finding fault with the "emphasis with which he sounds the praises of *sentiment*, the *heart* and *love*" [Cf. Flaubert, *Correspondance*, vol. ii., p. 110, 1852]. His voice is echoed by that of a poet :

> Tel qu'un morne animal, meurtri, plein de poussière,
> La chaine au cou, hurlant au chaud soleil d'été,
> Promène qui voudra son cœur ensanglanté,
> Sur ton pavé cynique, ô plèbe carnassiére. . .

Both Flaubert and Leconte de Lisle proclaim in reality

resulted three definite obligations for criticism :—the obligation to explain ;—the obligation to classify ;—and the obligation of tending, by means of the interpretation of literary works, towards a "philosophic" knowledge of the human intelligence.—That for all these reasons *Port-Royal* is beyond question one of the great books of the century ;—and the work of Sainte-Beuve one of the most original of our time ;—as well as one of the most fertile in consequences.

3. *From 1850 to 1870.*—The period of the *Causeries du lundi* and of the *Nouveaux lundis* ;—the most vaunted portion of Sainte-Beuve's work ;—but not however the best ;—since the author is too constantly influenced in his appreciation of works and still more of men by "topical" hatreds ;—since not one of his contemporaries dies [Balzac, 1850 ; Musset, 1857 ; Vigny, 1863] without his using or abusing the opportunity to settle his old quarrels with them ;—and since by dint of carrying his method to extremes he is brought to concern himself almost exclusively with the men and scarcely at all with the works.—The truth is that towards 1860, the necessity of defending his own originality against certain writers who claimed to be his disciples,—Edmond Scherer, Ernest Renan, and Taine for example,—forces him to lay stress on two points which he declines to abandon.—He establishes victoriously that what is interesting in a literary work is in the first place the work itself.—He then establishes no less surely that no general considerations are capable of explaining what is individual about a masterpiece ;—and that given "race," "environment," and "the moment," which

that the world has had enough of "confessions" and "disclosures." Nature and society, art and life, truth and beauty invite the poet, the novelist, and the dramatist to look beyond themselves, to open their eyes on the universe around them. Everything is "material for literature" with the single exception of what served the Romanticists as such. And while Flaubert, Feuillet, Dumas, Augier, or Leconte de Lisle as the result of study or observation are arriving at this conviction almost unintentionally, Taine and Renan appear to strengthen it, to lend it the weight of their authority and to establish it as a principle.

A writer is not always fully alive to the nature of his

are the same for all,—the great problem is to explain how it is that there has been only one *Tartufe* and one *Phèdre*;—one Voltaire and one Rousseau;—one *Eugénie Grandet* and one *Valentine*.—Having made this demonstration, however, he grows indifferent to his own principles;—as to the most pronounced of his former tastes;—history proper attracts him more and more;—he takes his title of "Senator of the Empire" seriously;—and scarcely anything remains of the author of *Port-Royal* in his *Étude sur Jomini*, for example, or in his *Essai sur Proudhon*.

C. *The Philosopher*;—and first of all whether this be not a decidedly ambitious appellation for him;—so far at least as to have a "philosophy" is to have a connected system;—a general view of things, or merely a "doctrine" [Cf. below the article TAINE].—That in this sense, not only did Sainte-Beuve never possess a "philosophy";—but his great defect as a critic and as an historian of literature,—was his inability to rise above the "monograph."—His theoretical contradictions and his naturally versatile humour.—But that this very versatility and these contradictions imply a sort of philosophy;—the principle of which is the perfecting of his taste by the variety of the disciplines to which he subjects it;—and this attitude is that to which the name of dilettantism is given.—Sainte-Beuve was the dilettante of criticism;—and it seems to have been more particularly in virtue of this fact that he exerted an influence on his contemporaries.

3. THE WORKS.—Sainte-Beuve's works comprise:—(1) his Poems;

work, or to the real influences by which he has been formed. Thus Renan would never admit, perhaps he never suspected, the extent to which he was imbued with the spirit of Auguste Comte; and Taine, who gloried on the contrary in being a Positivist—though a Positivist modified by the study of Stuart Mill—was more than astonished, was positively grieved when his attention was called to the works for which his *Essai sur Balzac*, 1858, and his *Histoire de la Littérature anglaise*, 1863, must be held responsible. No doubt there is a distinction to be drawn. The "naturalism" of Taine, as also that of Flaubert, was a broader and in particular a more intelligent conception of art than the realism, say, of a Courbet

Joseph Delorme, 1829; the *Consolations*, 1830; and the *Pensées d'août*, 1837;—(2) his Novel: *Volupté*, 1834;—and (3) his Critical Works:

Portraits littéraires, 3 volumes;
Portraits de femmes, 1 volume;
Portraits contemporains, 5 volumes;
Port-Royal, 5 volumes in 8vo or 7 volumes in 8vo;
Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire, 2 volumes;
Causeries du lundi, 15 volumes;
Nouveaux lundis, 13 volumes.

To the above may be added: his *Tableau de la Poésie française au XVI^e siècle*;—his *Premiers lundis*, three volumes issued after his death and containing articles he had not collected himself;—his *Étude sur Virgile*;—and two or three rather insignificant short tales.

Only three volumes of his Correspondence have been published as yet, and scarcely anything of his famous "Notebooks."

THIRD PERIOD.

Naturalism.

1859-1875.

I.—**Alfred de Vigny** [Loches, 1797; † 1863, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—*Journal d'un poète*, edited by M. Louis Ratisbonne; and the Notice preceding the *Journal*, Paris, 1867;—Sainte-

or a Champfleury; for example it did not proscribe the "representation" either of beauty or of the past [Cf. *Salammbô, Hérodias, la Légende de saint Julien*], in the consciousness that to have done so would have been to exclude from art the very notion of art. Again it was all very well for the author of the *Histoire des langues sémitiques*, 1848, and of the celebrated *Essai sur les Religions de l'antiquité*, 1853, to believe and to declare that "M. Comte, not being a philologist, had no comprehension of the sciences of humanity" [Cf. *l'Avenir de la science*, p. 148]. It is true that M. Comte was not a philologist, and his style was bad, but Renan's "philology" bore a closer resemblance than he imagined

Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*, vol. ii., 1826, 1835; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. vi., 1864;—Émile Montégut, *Nos Morts contemporains*, 1867;—Théophile Gautier, *Rapport sur les progrès de la poésie*, 1868;—Émile Faguet, *XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1887;—Maurice Paléologue, *Alfred de Vigny*, Paris, 1891;—F. Brunetière, *Essais sur la littérature contemporaine*, 1891; and *l'Évolution de la Poésie lyrique*, 1893, vol. ii.;—Dorison, *Alfred de Vigny, poète philosophe*, 1892.

2. THE POÈTE.

A. *The years of Romanticism.*—Vigny's extraction;—his education;—and his military vocation.—His first published verse: *Héléna*, 1822, and *Éloa*, 1824;—and, in this connection, of André Chénier's influence on Alfred de Vigny.—Character of his early verse, and how visibly inspired it is by the eighteenth century [Cf. Montégut, *loc. cit.*];—but in particular how little Romantic it is.—The novel *Cinq-Mars*, 1826;—and *Moïse*, 1826.—Vigny's personal relations with the Romanticists;—and the part he took in the conflict with Classicism;—with his *Othello*, 1829;—his drama the *Maréchale d'Ancre*, 1831;—and his "symbolical" novel *Stello*, 1832.—Three at least of the characteristics of Romanticism are met with in *Chatterton*, 1835:—striving after "local colour"; assertion of the "sovereignty of the poet" and that of the "rights of the individual."—Already, however, in his *Grandeur et Servitude militaires*, published in 1835,—Vigny appears to have renounced the egoism of the Romanticists;—as too in the portions of his *Journal* belonging to this period;—and since his attitude in this matter constitutes the principle and nature of his to the "sociology" of the founder of Positivism, the difference between them being not even one of method, but lying in the particular application of the same general method to matters so utterly dissimilar as, for instance, the study of the functions of the liver and that of the composition of the Bhagavata Pourana. This will be apparent if, inserting a middle term between two extremes, the work of Emile Littré be interposed between that of Taine and that of Renan: on the one hand his treatise on the philosophy of Auguste Comte, and on the other his writings on the history of the French language. It will then be plain, that whatever differences there be between the respective talents of

originality,—the question of his exact rank among the Romanticists becomes futile.

B. *The philosopher*;—and, in this connection, of Pessimism in general;—and that it is not the doctrine of death or inertia it has been asserted to be;—but, on the contrary, a source of fruitful action; —and in any case the principle of all moral elevation:—Vigny's Pessimism;—and that it is to rob him of what is best in him,—to look for its cause in the narrowness of his domestic life;—or in the humiliations to which his pride was subjected;—or, as some "clever" persons have done, in the physiological presentiment of the disease of which he was to die [cancer of the stomach].—Vigny's Pessimism is a philosophic doctrine;—based on the reasoned conviction of the hostile attitude of nature towards man [Cf. the *Maison du Berger*]; —on the isolation that is the consequence of the possession of intelligence [Cf. *Moïse*];—on the corruption of human nature [Cf. *la Colère de Samson*];—and on the indifference of the Gods to our sufferings [Cf. *le Christ au Mont des Oliviers*].—That in all these respects Vigny's Pessimism is akin to that of Pascal;—and that proof of this is furnished by the consequences that he deduces from his Pessimism;—for the horror inspired him by the human state changes into pity for his fellow men [Cf. his *Journal* from 1835 onward];—this pity into love [Cf. *la Flûte*];—this love into the resolution to strive to vanquish nature [Cf. *la Sauvage*];—and finally this resolution terminates in a cry of hope [Cf. *la Bouteille à la mer*].—Haughty but real nobleness of this Pessimism;—and

Littré, Taine, and Renan,—and it may be maintained that the excellent Littré was entirely without talent,—the three of them together constituted naturalistic criticism, or rather, and as it may better be put, their criticism gave "Naturalism" that doctrinal adhesion, consistency and solidity which Romanticism had always lacked.

It is this circumstance that makes it easy to-day to distinguish the true characteristics of Naturalism, and to perceive clearly that works so different in appearance as the *Poèmes antiques*, 1852, the *Demi-Monde*, 1855, and *Madame Bovary*, 1857, have nevertheless, in the first place, this in common, that they are what we call

---

that to appreciate its worth,—it is only necessary to compare it with the realistic Optimism of Hugo;—the childish Optimism of Musset;—and the vulgar Optimism of the author of the *Dieu des bonnes gens*.

C. *The influence of Alfred de Vigny*;—and that it is in opposition on almost every point with the influence of Romanticism.—Vigny freed the poet from the slavish cult of his personality;—and from the superstitious worship of nature.—For the lyric "themes" of Romanticism;—which could not be other than general or indeterminate themes,—and like those of pianists a pretext for the exercise of virtuosity,—he substituted precise "ideas";—of which his fictions [*la Mort du Loup*; *la Maison du Berger*; *la Bouteille à la mer*] are merely the envelope;—and for this reason he was a true symbolist;—and a great poet.—Finally he wrote "poems";—which have a beginning, a middle and an end;—the development of which is proportioned to the human importance of the idea they express;—and thus is not solely measured by the caprice of the virtuoso;—or the "long-windedness" of the poet.—For all these reasons it cannot be too much regretted,—that Vigny too often shows himself deficient in certain qualities that go to make the artist or even the writer.—Still he is nevertheless a very great poet;—and the author of some hundreds of verses;—if there be any superior to which in French, they are few in number.

3. THE WORKS.—The Works of Alfred de Vigny comprise:

(1) His Poetry. He has himself sacrificed some of his earliest pieces. What remains forms two volumes: the *Poésies*, divided into

"impersonal" works. It is important to state exactly what is meant by this epithet. It does not convey that a Flaubert, a Dumas, or a Leconte de Lisle are absent or severed from their work to such a degree that it is impossible to gather from their writings their conceptions of art, nature, and man. What is meant is that the object of their observation, the matter of their literature, is not they themselves; that the man in them is subordinate to the artist; and more especially that they made their originality consist in expressing, not things appertaining to themselves, but things which before them had passed unperceived. The radii of a circle were equal before the figure had been drawn, and it was not Galileo who set

three books, the *Livre mystique*, the *Livre antique*, and the *Livre moderne*, 1822–1826;—and the *Destinées*, 1863 [the *Destinées* were first collected and published under this title in 1863, but the majority of the poems which compose the volume were written during the years 1843, 1844, 1845 and 1854, and appeared at these dates in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*].

(2) His Plays, including his translation [in verse] of the *Merchant of Venice*, 1828; —his adaptation [in verse] of *Othello*, 1829;—the *Maréchal d'Ancre*, 1831;—*Quitte pour la peur*, 1833;—*Chatterton*, 1835.

(3) His Novels: *Cinq-Mars*, 1826;—*Stello*, 1832;—*Grandeur et servitude militaires*, 1835.

(4) His *Journal*, published in 1867 by M. Louis Ratisbonne, his literary executor; and some Letters [Cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits contemporains*], the most considerable series of which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for January, 1897.

There are two editions of his works, one in eight volumes in 8vo, Paris, 1868–1870, Michel Lévy; and the other in six vols. in 12mo, Paris, 1883–1885, A. Lemerre.

II.—**Pierre-Jules-Théophile Gautier** [Tarbes, 1811; † 1872, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Vte de Spœlberch de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier*, Paris, 1887.

Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. vi., 1863;—Émile Montégut, the earth moving around the sun! Similarly French provincial life existed before *Madame Bovary*, and the author of the *Poèmes antiques* invented neither the Gods of India nor those of Greece, neither their legend nor even their attributes. The unique ambition of these writers was to present the object they were imitating "under its eternal aspect," and to do so they concerned themselves solely with what they believed to be its permanent characteristics.

"Art," wrote Flaubert, "consists in representation, and we ought to confine ourselves to representing"; and in another passage of his *Correspondance*: "Art should have nothing in common with the artist." He declares,

Nos morts contemporains, vol. ii., 1865;—Charles Baudelaire, *l'Art romantique*, 1868;—Émile Bergerat, *Théophile Gautier*, *Entretiens et Souvenirs*, Paris, 1877;—Émile Zola, *Documents littéraires*, Paris, 1881;—Maxime du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, Paris, 1882–1884; and *Théophile Gautier*, in the "Grands Ecrivains français" series, Paris, 1890;—Émile Faguet, *Études sur le XIX^e^ siècle*, 1887, Paris; —F. Brunetière, *Questions de critique*, 1887;—and *l'Évolution de la Poésie lyrique*, vol. ii., 1893;—Maurice Spronck, *les Artistes littéraires*, Paris, 1889.

2. The Artist.—The critics were long unjust to Théophile Gautier;—reasons for this injustice;—the extent and diversity of his work;—its negligent or improvised air;—and the scrupulousness with which he confined himself to his "trade" of poet and story writer.—Pedantic indignation of Edmond Scherer in this connection;—and the reproach he addressed Gautier that "he was without ideas."—It is the truth that Gautier was without political or theological ideas;—but he had ideas about his art, or about art in general;—very clear and very fruitful ideas;—which he has expressed in very happy terms [Cf. his Notices on Balzac and Baudelaire, his *Rapport sur la poésie*, &c.].—It is for this reason that his rôle, the importance of which it was possible to overlook thirty or forty years ago,—has been seen to have been considerable,—in proportion as the relations between and the common or contradictory elements in Romanticism and Naturalism have been more clearly perceived.

in other words, that nature and history lying before us as models, and our momentary view of them being powerless to prevent them being what they are, what they were before our time, and what they will be after we have passed away, we ought to employ the resources of art to render the models with truth and fidelity. The imitation, or, to use a stronger term, the reproduction of nature, ought to be the object of art; scrupulous following of the model its method; while its triumph will be the annihilation of the personality of the artist in virtue of the truth of his creation. Does one think of Shakespeare when Othello kills Desdemona, or are readers of the Odyssey concerned with knowing what manner of man was

---

Thus it is in his work [Cf. the *Grotesques* and *Capitaine Fracasse*] that the affinities between Romanticism and the school, not of Ronsard,—as Sainte-Beuve erroneously taught,—but of the Scarrons and the Saint-Amants,—come into view and assert themselves openly;—and in this respect an entire portion of his work is nothing more than an "illustration" or a "demonstration" of the Preface to Hugo's *Cromwell*.—The great ambition of Romanticism was to combine the high-flown "sublimeness" of the Cid;—with the extravagant comedy of *Dom Japhet d'Arménie*.—It was Théophile Gautier, too, who formulated the doctrine of "art for art";—and though the doctrine is open to discussion;—its first effects were nevertheless excellent.—The doctrine of art for art put an end to everlasting self-contemplation on the part of the poet;—it again confronted him with an "exterior world," the significance of which had been disfigured by Romanticism;—and it reawakened in him the sentiment of the power of style.—That in this respect, and taking into account the difference between the periods,—there are similarities between the role of the author of *Émaux et Camées* and that of Malherbe and Boileau;—and that he was indeed the legislator of a new Parnassus.—Finally it was Théophile Gautier, and not Hugo;—or any other of the Romanticists;—who effected in the art of description [Cf. *España*, or, in prose, the *Roman de la momie*]—the "picturesque" revolution which Sainte-Beuve announced, or of which he had a presentiment, but which he did not realise.—"Seeing" is an art;—and independently of the emotion they procure us, Homer? But these theories, though expressed in more pretentious terms,—a fashion set by Romanticism,—are easily recognisable as among those which formerly were dear to the most illustrious Classicists; and the truth is that as regards the simplicity of its scheme and its force of expression there is no novel more "classic" than *Madame Bovary*. I am not aware that finer—and again I mean more "classic"—verses exist than those of Leconte de Lisle, and when I search for a work with which to compare the *Demi-Monde*, after reviewing the literature of the century I pass it by, and do not find what I want until I come to the period of the *Barbier de Séville* or of *Turcaret*.

there exists in things,—and especially in human things,—qualities with which others, prior to ourselves, have endowed them.—It is these qualities that we ought to try to see in them;—and to present "under their eternal aspect";—without regard to ourselves or to our pleasure.

That Théophile Gautier was more than once successful in this endeavour;—and, in this connection, that it is strange that such stories as the *Roi Candaule*, or *Arria Marcella*, or the *Roman de la momie* are not held in at least equal esteem to *Carmen* or *Colomba*.—Théophile Gautier's travels;—and that if the date of the first of them (1839, 1840) be kept in view,—it would seem that they revealed to him the nature of his talent.—His three volumes of poetry: *Albertus*, —*España*,—*Émaux et Camées*;—and that it is in them that the "lack of ideas" with which he has been reproached is particularly visible.—It will be noted that the case of Malherbe is parallel,—for while Malherbe, like Gautier, is the author of a certain number of very beautiful verses;—his value as a "critic" and a grammarian,—and as a "versifier,"—much surpasses his value as a writer.

3. The Works.—There is no edition of the Complete Works of Gautier, and doubtless there never will be, for it would run to from sixty to eighty volumes. His works comprise:

(1) His Poetry: *Poésies*, 1830;—*Albertus*, 1833;—the *Comédie de la mort*, 1838.—These three volumes, with *España* adjoined, were published in 1845 under the title *Poésies complètes*.—There remains for mention *Émaux et Camées*, 1852;

To say nothing, however, of the wealth and variety of meaning which has come to be expressed by the very word " nature " in the course of two hundred years, there is a difference between the new and the classic conception of art, and it lies in the fact that the standard by which the truth of artistic representations is judged is henceforth neither " common sense " nor the pronouncements of " society " nor considerations of " social interest " ; this function is now filled by science, and the circumstance is a second characteristic of the new Naturalism. Not that which seems to be, but that which is, constitutes truth ; and under certain rigorously defined conditions the individual may be right and the universe wrong. What is

(2) His Fiction, the principal works being : *Les Jeunes France, romans goguenards*, 1833 ;—*Mademoiselle de Maupin*, 1835 ;—*Fortunio*, 1837 [published under the title of *l'Eldorado*] ;—his *Nouvelles* 1845 ;—his *Romans et Contes*, 1857 ;—the *Roman de la momie*, 1858 ; —and the *Capitaine Fracasse*, 1863 ;

(3) His accounts of his travels,—*Tra los montes* [His journey to Spain], 1843 ;—*Constantinople*, 1853 ;—*Italia* ;—*Voyage en Russie*, 1867 ;

(3) His Critical Works : A. Literary Criticism, the principal being : *les Grotesques*, 1853 ;—his *Rapport sur les progrès de la poésie*, 1868 ; —the collection of anecdotic and biographical articles entitled : *Histoire du romantisme*, 1874 ; and various Notices, of which the most interesting are the *Notice sur H de Balzac* and the *Notice sur Charles Baudelaire* ;—B. Dramatic criticism, only a portion of which has been published under the title *Histoire de l'art dramatique depuis vingt-cinq ans*, 6 vols., 1858–1859, Paris ;—C. His Art criticism.

He has also left some dramatic writings, more especially ballet librettos, and a mass of occasional writings.

III.—**Emile Augier** [Valence, 1820 ; † 1889, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Émile Montégut, *Dramaturges et romanciers*, 1878 ;—Émile Zola, *Nos auteurs dramatiques*, 1881 ;—René Doumic, *Portraits d'écrivains*, Paris, 1892 ;—H. Parigot, *le Théâtre d'hier*, Paris, 1893 ;—Maurice Spronck, *Émile Augier*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 15, 1895.

meant here? and are Flaubert's novels, Leconte de Lisle's poetry, or Alexandre Dumas' plays "scientific work"? That they are such work is at any rate the belief of the authors. They expressly state so. "Art and science, wrote Leconte de Lisle, long separated in consequence of the divergent efforts of the intelligence, should tend henceforth towards *a close union or even absolute identification.* The one has been the initial revelation of the ideal contained in exterior nature; the other its luminous and reasoned explanation. But art has lost this primitive spontaneity, and *it belongs to science to remind it of its forgotten traditions*, which it will revive in the forms that are proper to it" [Cf.

The student may further consult in connection with Augier, and the other dramatic authors of this period, the dramatic criticisms of Théophile Gautier in the *Moniteur*, of Jules Janin in the *Journal des Débats*, and of Francisque Sarcey in the *Temps*. Also those of M. Jules Lemâitre, which have been issued in volume form under the title *Impressions de théâtre.*

2. THE DRAMATIST.—His first efforts.—He is called the "lieutenant" of François Ponsard and the "School of good sense."—That if the author of *La Ciguë*, 1844, of *l'Aventurière*, 1848, and of *Gabrielle*, 1849, was pleased to reconcile himself with Romanticism towards the close of his career,—it is nevertheless a fact that all his early pieces were directed against the Romanticists;—and *Diane* in particular is merely *Marion Delorme* rewritten by a "man of good sense;"—just as *Gabrielle* merely ridicules from a bourgeois point of view the heroines of George Sand.—It was as an adversary of Romanticism that Augier was first hailed by his admirers;—and if his collaboration with Jules Sandeau;—the outcome of which was the *Chasse au Roman*, 1851; the *Pierre de touche*, 1854; and the *Gendre de M. Poirier*;—seemed for a moment to indicate that he was reconciled with the Romanticists,—it was not long before he ceased to find himself at home in comedy of this sentimental and average order.—And finally it was by renouncing Romanticism and declaiming against it,—in the *Mariage d'Olympe*, 1855, *les Lionnes pauvres*, 1858, and *la Jeunesse*, 1858;—that he achieved his originality.

Poèmes antiques, 1852, preface to the first edition]. And in truth if there exist in French literature poetry that can be called "scientific," is it not that of Leconte de Lisle? Again, who has had a clearer vision of the poetry of science than the author of the *Histoire de la Littérature anglaise*? Taine has boldly stated his views: "Two ways are open to man to arrive at a knowledge of the permanent and generating causes; *the first is offered by science*, by which he determines these causes and these fundamental laws, and expresses them in exact formulæ and abstract terms; *the second is offered by art*, by which he manifests these causes in perceptible fashion, appealing not only to the reason, but

---

It consists essentially in the rather brutal vigour with which he championed certain ideas,—whose defenders as a rule are wont to display some hesitation or timidity,—the ideas in question being in point of fact as commonplace as they are unexceptionable;—Augier, for instance, clearly demonstrated that "a good name is better than riches,"—and that a courtesan does not recover her innocence because she is stirred by a genuine passion.—He has also proved that what are called business men are often enough lacking in scruples [Cf. *les Effrontés*];—and that designing persons sometimes come to a bad end [Cf. *la Contagion*];—and all this, if it was not anti-romanticism,—was something else than Romanticism.—Secondly, with a view to introducing Realism into his work,—he devised contemporary plots;—the personages of which were imitated from those of Balzac [Cf. *les Effrontés*, *le Fils de Giboyer*, *Maître Guérin*],—or of Eugène Sue [Cf. *Lions et Renards*];—among them being two or three whose characterisation is fairly vigorous.—Moreover, after Balzac and in imitation of him, he gave a novel importance to the money question,—making the play turn on it,—instead of regarding it, as Scribe regarded it, as a mere subsidiary dramatic expedient.—To complete the resemblance, he in general turned to account in his plays the interests of every-day life;—industrial enterprise [Cf. *les Effrontés*], scientific discoveries or inventions [Cf. *Un beau mariage*; *Maître Guérin*], political events [Cf. *le Fils de Giboyer*].—Finally, and here he parts company with Balzac,—he adopted the attitude of "a bourgeois of 1789";—the enemy of vain distinctions;—exclusively to the heart and the senses of the most ordinary man" [Cf. *Philosophie de l'Art*, vol. i., p. 53]. It may be, however, that these arguments are specious rather than solid, and were there but a single one to adduce, an example at least would be desirable of art having "anticipated" science. Still it must be admitted that it never occurred to the Classicists to unite, solidarise or identify science and art in this way, if indeed it ought not to be said that they constantly insisted on their opposition to one another; and the observation is of interest for its own sake, and further because it leads up to another and a more profound difference, and one not less characteristic of "Naturalism."

respecting "personal merit";—and anti-clerical after the manner of Béranger [Cf. *le Fils de Giboyer*, *Lions et Renards*];—and this attitude largely contributed to his success.—It is doubtless this attitude too that his admirers propose to praise when they declare him to belong to "the family of Molière."

His dramatic merit proper, however, is not much superior to that of Eugène Scribe;—while too much has been made of his merit as a writer;—of his "sturdy frankness" and his "virile correction."—His verse is curiously prosaic, except perhaps in certain passages of *Philiberte* or of the *Aventurière*;—and his prose is in general monotonous;—though natural enough.—His dramatic expedients are often very artificial;—and his plots decidedly fanciful [Cf. the *Gendre de M. Poirier*, *Mariage d'Olympe*, *Un beau mariage*, *Maître Guérin*, *les Fourchambault*].—It does not appear, moreover, that he even suspected the existence of the great problems of life;—and thought is absent from his work;—which is that, however, of a highly estimable man;—whose literary ambitions did not outstrip his capacity;—and who cannot be better characterised,—in respect both to his shortcomings and his qualities,—than by comparing him with the author of *Turcaret* and *Gil Blas*.

2. THE WORKS.—Apart from his plays Émile Augier's works are restricted to two volumes of poetry: *Poésies complètes d'Émile Augier*, Paris, 1852, Lévy;—and the *Pariétaires*, Paris, 1855, Lévy;—and to some brochures of slight interest.

His plays comprise twenty-nine pieces, two of which, for unknown

For a third characteristic of contemporary Naturalism is that to which it has itself given the name of "impassibility," a term that must be held to signify not want of sensibility, but the most complete indifference to whatever is not art or science. Is the man of science in his laboratory moved to indignation by the poisons he manipulates; and what economic or moral value does he set on the animals he dissects? A fact in his eyes is a fact and nothing more: he notes it, but does not pass judgment on it. The attitude of the artist is identical. And it is for this reason that if Dumas *fils*, in whom there are traces of the Romanticism of his father, has an opinion about Suzanne d'Ange [Cf. the

reasons, he eliminated from the complete edition of his dramatic works: the *Chasse au Roman*, 1851;—and the *Méprises de l'amour*, 1852.

Several of his plays were written in collaboration with other authors: with Musset, *l'Habit vert*, 1849;—with Jules Sandeau, *la Pierre de touche*, 1853; the *Gendre de M. Poirier*, 1854;—with Édouard Foussier, *Ceinture dorée*, 1855; the *Lionnes pauvres*, 1858; —with Eugène Labiche, *le Prix Martin*, 1876.

The plays of which he is the sole author are: in verse, *la Ciguë*, 1844; *Un homme de bien*, 1845; *l'Aventurière*, 1848; *Gabrielle*, 1849; *Sapho* [an opera, music by Gounod], 1851; the *Joueur de flûte*, 1851; *Diane*, 1852; *Philiberte*, 1853; *la Jeunesse*, 1858; *Paul Forestier*, 1868; and in prose; the *Mariage d'Olympe*, 1855; *Un beau mariage*, 1859; *les Effrontés*, 1861; *le Fils de Giboyer*, 1862; *Maître Guérin*, 1864; *la Contagion*, 1866; *le Post-Scriptum*, 1869; *Lions et Renards*, 1869; *Jean de Thommeray* [founded on a story by Jules Sandeau], 1873; *Madame Caverlet*, 1876; and *les Fourchambault*, 1878.

The last complete edition of his dramatic works [revised and corrected, according to the old-established practice] is that of 1889, in seven volumes, Paris, Calmann Lévy.

IV.—**Octave Feuillet** [Saint-Lô, 1821; † 1890, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Mme Octave Feuillet, *Quelques années de ma vie*, 1894, Paris; *Souvenirs et Correspondances*, 1896, Paris;—Émile

Demi-Monde], Flaubert has none about Emma Bovary, or about Salammbô, or about Frédéric Moreau [Cf. *l'Éducation sentimentale*], refuses to have one, and loses patience when his opinion is asked. "As to giving my opinion about the personages in my novels, he wrote to George Sand, no, no, a thousand times no! I do not admit my right to an opinion. If the reader does not draw from the book the moral that ought to be found in it, either the reader is a blockhead, or the book is at fault as regards exactness" [Cf. *Correspondance*, vol. iii.]. The author of the *Poèmes antiques* was of the same way of thinking. "The poet, in his estimation, should look on human things as a God might look on them from the heights of Olympus, should reflect them unconcernedly

Montégut, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December, 1858, November, 1862, January, 1868;—Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. v., 1863;—Jules Lemaître, *Les contemporains*, 3rd series, 1887, Paris;—Ch. Le Goffic, *Les romanciers d'aujourd'hui*, Paris, 1890;—F. Brunetière, *Essais sur la littérature contemporaine*, Paris, 1891;—René Doumic, *Portraits d'écrivains*, Paris, 1892.

2. THE NOVELIST.—It is as a Romanticist that he begins his career—and as a dramatist;—writing in collaboration with Bocage:—*Un bourgeois de Rome*, 1845, and *la Vieillesse de Richelieu*, 1848.—His first novel, *Bellah*, 1850;—and its resemblance to Balzac's *Chouans* on the one hand;—and on the other to the novels of Jules Sandeau.—The *Scènes et Proverbs*, 1851;—*Scènes et Comédies*, 1855;—and that the author of these works has been not inaptly described as a "family Musset."—His hesitations between budding Naturalism [Cf. *le Village*, 1852],—and expiring Romanticism [Cf. *Rédemption*, 1849, and *Dalila*, 1853];—and how he tries to conciliate the one with the other by writing romantic (not "Romantic") novels [Cf. *La Petite Comtesse*, 1856, and the *Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*, 1858].

His chief works.—*Histoire de Sibylle*, 1862,—George Sand's rejoinder: *Mademoiselle de la Quintinie*;—*M. de Camors*, 1867;—*Julia de Trécœur*, 1872;—*Le journal d'une femme*, 1878;—*La Morte*, 1886;—*Honneur d'artiste*, 1890.—Are Feuillet's novels "romantic" novels?—and that the epithet romantic is synonymous with in his fixed pupils, and maintaining absolute indifference, should endow them with form, that higher kind of life" [Cf. Th. Gautier, *Rapport*, &c.]. Whether Leconte de Lisle always realised his ideal is another question, but he strove to attain to it, and his ideal in reality is that of "art for art." The merit of the artist is to rise superior, as an artist, to the agitations or occupations of his fellow men; and while, as a man, he is constrained to live the life of other men, he is an artist and a "naturalist" in proportion only as he does not participate in this life.

The success and the vogue of these ideas was largely due to the fact that, by a consequence whose close connection with them will doubtless be perceived, they reawakened in the writer a sense of the difficulties of

strange incidents;—arbitrary combinations;—systematic idealisation of the characters;—and excessive sentimentalism;—it is not applicable to Feuillet's novels;—which, however, are "aristocratic" or "society" novels;—because the author himself was a member of "society";—a sphere of existence in which the development of passion is not interfered with by the mean realities of life;—those who belong to it not being prevented, by the necessity of earning their living, from keeping a rendezvous;—and not being the slaves of the exigencies of material existence [Cf. in this respect, the princes and princesses of classic tragedy].—His novels in the second place are idealistic novels;—because the duties of ordinary life are suppressed in them;—because they owe their dramaticness in general to the conflict between "passion" and "honour" [Cf. Alfred de Vigny, *Grandeur et Servitude militaires*];—and because vanquished honour and passion find no other refuge in them than in death [Cf. the habitual *dénouements* of classic tragedy]. Finally they are novels with a purpose,—their author showing himself constantly concerned with the "rights" or the condition of women;—with the dignity of love and marriage;—and with the principle of social morality.—Comparison, in this connection, between Feuillet's novels and those of George Sand;—and that in reality, in spite of a certain apparent analogy,—they are more unlike than like.

3. The Works.—They comprise his Plays, the complete edition of which in five volumes [Calmann Lévy, 1892, 1893] includes all of his

the art of writing, and revived that respect for the language and that religious veneration for style without which nobody who has written in French has left anything lasting. "The French genius," wrote a good judge, "as represented by the writers of the present day (1858), is regaining qualities it seemed to have lost. Simplicity is taking the place of a confused and pretentious jargon, clearness that of magniloquence. Every writer now knows what he wants to say; tirades have ceased to pass muster; there is an end to declamation ; authors are no longer open-mouthed as if their every word were about to shake heaven and earth" [Cf. J. J. Weiss, *le Théatre et les mœurs : M. Alexandre Dumas fils*].

pieces that have been put on the stage, among the number being some of those contained in the two volumes: *Scènes et Proverbes*, and *Scènes et Comédies*;

And his novels: *Bellah*, 1850;—*La petite Comtesse*, 1856;—the *Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*, 1858;—*Histoire de Sibylle*, 1862;—*M. de Camors*, 1867;—*Julia de Trécœur*, 1872;—*Un mariage dans le monde*, 1875;—*Les amours de Philippe*, 1877;—the *Journal d'une femme*, 1878;—the *Histoire d'une Parisienne*, 1881;—*La Veuve*, 1883;—*La Morte*, 1886;—and *Honneur d'artiste*, 1891.

V.—**Charles-Marie-René Leconte de Lisle** [Saint-Paul, Ile de la Réunion, 1818; † 1894, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Charles Baudelaire's Notice in Crepet's *Recueil des Poètes français*, vol. iv., Paris, 1865;—Th. Gautier, *Rapport sur les progrès de la poésie*, 1867;—Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, Paris, 1886;—Maurice Spronck, *Les artistes littéraires*, Paris, 1889;—Jules Lemaître, *Les contemporains*, vol. ii., 1893;—F. Brunetière, *l'Évolution de la poésie lyrique*, vol. ii., 1893;—and *Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine*, 1895;—Jean Dornis, *Lecomte de Lisle*, Paris, 1895;—Henry Houssaye, *Discours de réception*, 1895.

2. THE POET.—A Romanticist at the outset of his career.—His residence at Rennes, and *La Variété*, a literary review, 1840–1841.—He comes to Paris and writes for the phalansterian publications;—

It is possible, and at the present day it is imperative to be even more precise. The insipid style—a legacy from the Ideologists or the Encyclopedists—which is exhibited ingenuously, without any sense of horror or consciousness of its lamentable shortcomings in the prose of a Villemain for example, and often even of a Guizot; the license which a Musset or a Lamartine—who were proud of the feat—carried more than once to extremes; the incoherent metaphors which are almost a stumbling-block in some of Hugo's masterpieces:

> Quand *notre âme* en rèvant descend dans *nos entrailles*,
> Comptant dans *notre cœur* qu'enfin la glace atteint;
> Comme on compte les morts sur un champ de batailles,
> Chaque douleur tombée et chaque songe éteint;

his first poems; *Hylas*, *Niobé*, *Hypatie*;—and his intervention in favour of the abolition of slavery.—He translates the Iliad.—Publication of the *Poèmes Antiques*, 1852;—of the *Poèmes et Poésies*, 1853;—and of the *Poèmes Barbares*, 1862.—Effect these poems produce on G. Flaubert [Cf. his Correspondence, particularly towards 1852–1853].—The Preface to the *Poèmes Antiques* [suppressed in subsequent editions];—and its frankly anti-Romanticist declarations.

The poetic inspiration of Leconte de Lisle so far as it was derived from the ancients;—and that it is anti-religious [Cf. *Hypatie*];—and marked by the Pagan love of pure beauty [Cf. *La Vénus de Milo*].—Resulting consequences: the theory of the impersonality of the poet;—religious veneration for style;—and the doctrine of art for art.—Hindoo antiquity in the poems of Leconte de Lisle [Cf. *Surya*, *Bhagavat*];—and that to this source must be traced the poet's Pessimism;—his exotic tastes;—and his conception of a "naturalistic and scientific" poetry.

Leconte de Lisle's poetic inspiration so far as it was due to exotic influences;—and, in this connection, of the influence of the author of *Émaux et Camées*;—and of that of the *Orientales*;—on the author of the *Poèmes Barbares*.—The influence of the Orientalists, however, seem to have been still more considerable,—in particular that of Eugène Burnouf [Cf. in Baudelaire's Notice, cited above, a very happy comparison between Leconte de Lisle and Ernest Renan].—Variety and beauty of the descriptive passages in Leconte de Lisle:—his the involved phrases and turns of expression which often cause the prose of Sainte-Beuve — particularly in his *Port-Royal*—to be a model of preciosity; the powerful heaviness, but also, if I may so express myself, the unmannerliness, the vulgar familiarity which make it so difficult for some persons of delicate taste to read *La Cousin Bette*, or the *Lys dans la Valleé*, — these defects are all of them absent from the *Poèmes barbares*, from the *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, from *Madame Bovary*, or from the *Vie de Jésus*, and are only lighted on in the dramas of Augier and Dumas.

But this is not all, for the impression must not be left that the Naturalists confined themselves in their writings

animals [Cf. *le Sommeil du condor*; *le Rêve du jaguar*; *les Éléphants*]; his landscapes [Cf. *le Bernica*; *la Fontaine aux lianes*];—his sense of the diversity of races [Cf. *le Cœur d'Hialmar*, *la Vérandah*, *la Tête du comte*].—That these descriptions are widely different from those of the Romanticists;—in virtue of the author's regard for exactness;—of his endeavour to keep them free from all trace of his personality;—of the intensity of the life with which he instills them [Cf. *la Panthère noire*; *les Hurleurs*].—Whether it be a fact that these characteristics bring his poetry into a line with science;—and in what measure it is allowable to describe his poetry as scientific?

Leconte de Lisle's poetic inspiration so far as it was derived from Pessimism,—and that this influence is the cause of the originality of his work.—Whether Vigny exerted an influence on Leconte de Lisle?—or whether they both derived their Pessimism from the same source?—That there is more nobleness in the Pessimism of Alfred de Vigny;—and in that of Leconte de Lisle not more sincerity, but a more communicative conviction.—Leconte de Lisle suffers, too, from his inability to rid himself of his rather narrow hostility to Christianity;—and from his disinclination to express any pity for "sorrowing humanity."—That this callousness, however, must not be imputed to his personal insensibility [Cf. *le Manchy*, *Qaïn l'Illusion suprême*];—but to his resolve to give utterance in his verse solely to the miseries of humanity;—and not to the miseries of the individual;—and also perhaps to his conception of style.

to avoiding the defects of the Romanticists. By associating art more closely with the imitation of nature, Flaubert and Taine, Leconte de Lisle and Renan imparted to style a degree of precision, of fulness, of solidity, or, to use Flaubert's expression, of "density," in which it had long been wanting. Certain magnificent verses of Leconte de Lisle:

> Le vent respectueux, parmi leurs tresses sombres,
> Sur leur nuque de marbre errait en frémissant,
> Tandis que les parois des rocs couleur de sang,
> Comme de grands miroirs suspendus dans les ombres,
> De la pourpre du soir baignaient leur dos puissant, . . .

certain pages of Flaubert,—the description of the agri-

Of the qualities of Leconte de Lisle's style;—and that there are no "greater verses" than his;—none more plastic;—none more harmonious.—They are a little wanting, however, in ease, or in "air," so to speak;—and also a little in variety.—He would have been better advised too had he avoided certain affectations of local colour;—which do not add to the truth of his descriptions:—while they tend to give rather a pedantic idea of true "Naturalism."—There is nothing more "natural" in writing *Phoibos* instead of *Phœbus* in French;—and neither the sentiment of antiquity;—nor the accuracy of distinction; —nor the survival of a work of art are dependent on such minutiæ.

3. THE WORKS.—Leconte de Lisle's works comprise: (1) his Poems, arranged as follows in the definite edition issued by himself: *Poèmes Antiques*; *Poèmes Barbares*; *Poèmes Tragiques*.—There is further a volume of posthumous works, *Derniers Poèmes*, published in 1895;

(2) His translations of the Iliad, the Odyssey, Hesiod, Æschylus, and Horace, which are spoiled by excessive literalness and seem to have been "written for the booksellers."

(3) His *Erinnyes*, a mere adaptation from Æschylus, more "Æschylean" than the original, which form part of the *Poémes Tragiques*, but must be classed apart, as they have been represented on the stage.

VI.—English Influence.

The English influence;—which had been undergone by everybody cultural show in *Madame Bovary*, or that of the forest of Fontainebleau in the *Education sentimentale*,—innumerable pages of Taine or Renan have impressed us as work that is "definite" and "finished." It may be questioned indeed whether they have not gone to extremes in this direction, for when they reached the point of believing, as Flaubert did in all seriousness, that an "assemblage of words" has "a beauty of its own" independently of what it expresses, were they not the dupes of a veritable artistic hallucination? I should be disposed, for my part, to hold that they were. However, it was their boundless faith in the virtue of style that recommended them in the first instance to their contemporaries;

to a slight extent since the beginning of the century;—and primarily by Chateaubriand;—but which had been chiefly felt hitherto in politics and history;—and in a somewhat vague manner;—begins to act on more definite lines towards 1855;—and by the intervention of certain writers,—Philarète Chasles, Émile Montégut, Taine,—in three principal directions.

1. By the writings of Émile Montégut;—who publishes in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1851–1858, a more thorough study of the English and American novel than any foreign author has ever made at any period of a foreign literature;—a sort of "realism" at once sentimental and caricatural;—is revealed to French readers.—Dickens and Thackeray are its principal representatives;—*David Copperfield* or *Vanity Fair* become almost as popular in France as in England;—after the appearance of Taine's admirable and well-known studies of Dickens and Thackeray.

2. At the same time Darwin's celebrated book *The Origin of Species*, 1858, appears in England and arouses considerable attention everywhere.—It is at once translated into French by Mlle Clémence Royer;—Flourens makes a pitiable attempt to refute it;—but it gives an extraordinary impulsion to natural history studies;—and through them to "naturalistic" ideas in art and criticism;—which seem in consequence to enjoy added authority.—In France, as in England and in Germany,—Darwin's book causes "biological science" to be regarded as the typical science in the place of "mathematical science."

and the talent for writing for which they were admired brought about the vogue of their æsthetic doctrines.

Certain of the critics, those of the academic and university school, with Sainte-Beuve at their head, and among his following, J. J. Weiss, Cuvillier-Fleury, and Prévost-Paradol, had made, it is true, a show of resistance, but they had not been listened to, and still less had their lead been followed. On the contrary, the last of the Romanticists themselves, Victor Hugo, George Sand, and Michelet, were seen to incline towards Naturalism. Thus there is no overlooking the fact that it is the *Poèmes Antiques* and the *Poèmes Barbares* that Victor Hugo has imitated, imitated as he was able, as he

3. Finally, and to say nothing of Émile Montégut's translation of Emerson's *Representative Men*,—or of Taine's study of English Idealism (*l'Idéalisme anglais*),—George Eliot's novels, *Adam Bede*, *Silas Marner*, etc., are translated, and the attention is called to them of the French public.—The characteristic of these novels is,—that they are advisedly, deliberately, and staunchly "naturalistic,"—the author having the advantage over all her contemporary novelists,—Flaubert included,—of a considerable philosophic training.—And thus it happens that with her Naturalism, —which is far from stopping short at the surface of things,—is introduced at the same time, for use in the near future,—the means of correcting and "idealising" it.

VII.—**Gustave Flaubert** [Rouen, 1821; † 1880, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Flaubert's *Correspondance*, 4 volumes, 1887–1893, Paris, and preceding the first volume: *Souvenirs intimes* [by Mme Commanville, his niece];—Guy de Maupassant, *Étude sur Gustave Flaubert*, preceding the complete edition of Flaubert's works;—Maxime du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, Paris, 1882–1884.

Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. xiii., 1858, and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. iv., 1862;—Saint-René Taillandier, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1863 (February) and 1869 (December);—F. Brunetière, *Le roman naturaliste*, 1877 and 1880;—Émile Zola, *Les romanciers naturalistes*, 1881;—Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 1883;—Louis Desprez, *l'Evolution naturaliste*, Paris, 1883;—

knew how to imitate, but still that he has imitated in his *Légende des Siècles.* Not that he ceased on this account to be a Romanticist! The *Rose de l'Infante,* or the *Raisons du Monotombo* continue to be, are above everything else the personal impressions and opinions aroused in Hugo by his subject. Nevertheless he strove, as far as his essentially lyric genius would allow him, to become epic, impersonal, and objective; and his efforts were occasionally successful. As to Michelet, he too did not abjure his method or refashion his "temperament." In the last volumes of his *Histoire de France* he continued only to concern himself with and to render in his prose the lyric thrill, so to speak, which events aroused in him.

Maurice Spronck, *Les artistes littéraires*, Paris, 1889;—Émile Hennequin, *La critique scientifique*, Paris, 1888;—J. Charles Tarver, *Gustave Flaubert*, London, 1895;—Bettelheim, *Deutschen und Franzosen*, Vienna, 1895.

2. THE NOVELIST.—His extraction;—he is first attracted by Romanticism;—his early friendships with Louis Bouilhet and Maxime du Camp,—his travels.—His conception of art [Cf. his Correspondence with his "Muse," Louise Colet];—and that it was originally the outcome of an excess of modesty:—"Little streams that overflow assume the airs of the ocean; and to be the ocean all they lack is dimension! Let us remain a river, and be content with turning our mill" [Cf. vol. ii., p. 190].—Flaubert's hatreds;—and, in contrast, his singular esteem for "that old stick of a Boileau."—Hesitations and first efforts: *La Tentation de Saint Antoine.*—His preoccupation with style;—and whether he did not carry it to lengths which made it a mania?

Unity of Flaubert's work;—and that whatever be said of *Madame Bovary* or *l'Éducation sentimentale*;—is equally applicable to *Salammbô* or the *Tentation de Saint Antoine.*—It is only the subject that differs;—the methods remain the same;—and the conception of art does not vary.—The author's first concern is to abstract himself from the reality he is depicting;—and to note in depicting it only those features which will leave the same impression,—on all those who study it with equal closeness [Cf. on this subject Sainte-Beuve's discussion with Flaubert concerning *Salammbô*].—But in the second

Still, in these very volumes, and more especially in the *Insecte*, the *Oiseau*, the *Femme* and *l'Amour*, he made the concession to Naturalism that he came to regard everything as a question of what may be termed physiological mysticism. In these works he is solely preoccupied by natural history; and henceforth the ultimate explanation of things lies in some veiled pathological detail. Shall I refer to George Sand? and shall I say that after the *Marquis de Villemer*, 1860, or perhaps *Monsieur Silvestre*, 1865, every fresh volume she adds to her work detracts from rather than increases her fame? Such is unhappily the truth, but in her decadence she too, she who was Valentine, who was Indiana, is bent on "getting

place the depiction ought to be typical,—and not anecdotical;—a contrary condition to that observed by Romanticism;—since while Romanticism singled out in character what may be called the "accidental" or the "unique" [Cf. *Notre-Dame de Paris*, the *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, *Colomba*],—character for Flaubert and Naturalism,—as for the science of his time,—consisted in the element which is durable and permanent in changing things.—In consequence, the experience of Emma Bovary may be treated in the same way as that of the daughter of Hamilcar;—and both may be regarded as embodying;—an entire "moment" of history;—an entire class of women;—and an entire civilisation.—This is what Flaubert means by the "solidity of the framework."—Thirdly, the work must be endowed with "the higher life of form";—by means of a style "as rhythmical as verse and precise as the language of the sciences";—whose power is to some extent intrinsic or existent in virtue of itself;—"independently of what is expressed";—and whose inherent beauty has some analogy with that of a line;—which is harmonious, graceful, and voluptuous in itself.—And Flaubert has complied with all these exigencies,—in *Salammbô* as in *Madame Bovary*, and in *l'Éducation sentimentale* as in the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*.

But all Flaubert's "realisations,"—with the exception of *Madame Bovary*,—have been spoiled by the intervention of the author of *Bouvard et Pécuchet*;—whose continuous irony is a perpetual breach of the principle of the impersonality of the artist;—and, in this connection, of Flaubert's Pessimism.—Its origin is purely literary;—and a closer grip of reality"; she descends from her cloudy heights, and with a modesty which does her honour consents to learn from Flaubert.

There is one point, however, on which they are unyielding, and happily so, since it is the vulnerable point of Naturalism. They do not admit that art should be severed from life, or that the artist should retire from the world and live in isolation. "*Action!*—wrote Michelet in 1866,—Voltaire in his *Lettres anglaises* has uttered the mighty word, the modern Symbol; *Man's object is action*" [Cf. *Histoire de France*, vol. xvi., 1st edition, 1866, pp. 426, 427]. George Sand, in turn, discussing her art with Flaubert, declares: "An author must

he is incensed against life and his fellow-men solely because they do not understand art in the same way as he does [Cf. his Correspondence]. —That this point of view is only legitimate—on the condition that he who adopts it confines himself strictly to his art;—and renounces the right to interpret or judge life, to do which is to go beyond his art.—Flaubert held that nothing existed outside art;—a belief that constituted his force;—but also, from another point of view, his weakness,—since there is more in life than art.—Narrowness, in this respect, of Flaubert's ideas;—and that they doubtless contributed to no slight extent to make the development of Naturalism follow narrow instead of spacious lines.—And that if this disdain for all that is not art is a characteristic of Romanticism,—the fact explains the Romantic element that is met with in work of the last representatives of Naturalism.

3. The Works.—Flaubert's works comprise:

(1) His Fiction: *Madame Bovary*, 1856 [in the *Revue de Paris*], and 1857, Michel Lévy;—*Salammbô* 1862;—*l'Éducation sentimentale*, 1870;—the *Tentation de Saint Antoine*, 1874 [fragments of the work had appeared in the *Artiste* in 1856 and 1857];—*Trois contes*;—and *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, 1881 [posthumous and unfinished].

(2) Two theatrical pieces: the *Candidat*;—and the *Château des cœurs*, 1879.

(3) Some short writings, of which the most important are the letter to Sainte-Beuve concerning *Salammbô*;—and the preface to the *Dernières Chansons de Louis Bouilhet*.

write for everybody, for all those who need to be initiated . . . There is all the secret of our persevering labour and of our love of art. *What is art without the hearts or the intelligences to which it ministers?*" [Cf. George Sand, *Correspondance*, vol. v., letter No. 616, October, 1866]. This is what Leconte de Lisle and Flaubert refused to understand;—and it is in the truth contained in this lesson that Naturalism, after having transformed literature, found the great obstacle to its propagation.

For other novelists, and foremost amongst them Octave Feuillet, the author of the *Histoire de Sibylle*, 1862, and of *Monsieur de Camors*, 1867, have realised the truth in question, and their influence in consequence has counter-

His complete works, less the Correspondence, have been issued in seven volumes, in 8vo, Paris, 1885, Quantin.

VIII.—**Hippolyte-Adolphe Taine** [Vouziers, 1828; † 1893, Paris].

1. The Sources.—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. xiii., 1857; and *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. viii., 1864;—G. Planche, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1857; Edmond Scherer, *Mélanges de critique religieuse*, 1858;—Emile Montégut, *Essais sur la littérature anglaise*, 1863;—Caro, *l'Idée de Dieu et ses nouveaux critiques*, Paris, 1864;—Abbé Guthlin, *Les doctrines positivistes en France*, Paris, 1865;—P. Janet, *La crise philosophique*, Paris, 1865;—F. Ravaisson, *Rapport sur les progrès de la philosophie*, Paris, 1868.

Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 1883;—Émile Hennequin, *La critique scientifique*, Paris, 1888;—F. Brunetière, *l'Évolution des genres*, vol. i., 1889;—E. M. de Vogüé, *Le dernier livre de Taine*, 1894;—G. Monod, *Renan, Taine et Michelet*, Paris, 1894;—A. de Margerie, *H. Taine*, Paris, 1894;—E. Dowden, *Literary criticism in France*, Boston, 1895;—G. Barzellotti, *Ippolito Taine*, Rome, 1895;—E. Boutmy, *Hippolyte Taine*, Paris, 1897.

2. The Evolution of Taine's Thought.—Taine's birth and training;—the years he passed at the École Normale [Cf. some letters on this subject in Gréard's *Prévost-Paradol*, Paris, 1895];—he begins his career as a professor.—The *Essai sur La Fontaine*, 1853;—the *Essais sur Tite-Live*, 1856;—the *Philosophes français au XIX^{e} siècle*, 1857;—and the *Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1858.

balanced that of the Naturalists. It was taken to heart, however, still more profoundly by the dramatists, whose art, as we have seen, disappears entirely if they lose touch with the public. "How many simpletons are necessary to form a public?" insolently demanded Chamfort. What he should have said was: How many spectators are necessary of every age and every social rank, who are in no wise "artists"? who have not the right to be artists, and whom in consequence it is the function of art to raise to its own level? And it happens in reality that after the slight surprise caused them by the doctrine of art for art, such writers as Feuillet, Augier, and Dumas free themselves from its bondage,

That under the influence of the philosophy of Spinosa, Hegel and Auguste Comte,—and of history as conceived by Michelet,—Taine's first act was to "purge" criticism of all moral intention,—and of all æsthetic pretensions;—and to reduce it to mere natural history.—The theory of the race, the environment and the moment;—and is it true that, as set forth by Taine, there is nothing new about it except its exaggeration?—It is Gustave Planche and not Sainte-Beuve who best appreciated the entire novelty of the method;—which lay in the fact that though its elements existed on every hand;—its "synthesis" had not been effected;—and still less had anybody perceived its consequences.—The application of the doctrine;—and the *Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 1863.—Criticism in Taine's eyes is "the natural history of intelligences";—the artist and the poet being in a very slight measure representative of themselves;—but rather the spokesmen at every period of an entire species of men, sentiments or ideas.

Taine continued to adhere to this theory until 1865.—At this juncture, having been appointed "Professor of Æsthetics and of the History of Art";—and being the most conscientious of men;—he came to recognise that it is impossible to discuss works of art without "judging" them;—or even to write their history without "classifying" them.—These new convictions are already visible in his *Philosophie de l'art en Italie*, 1865;—and more clearly so in his *Voyage en Italie*, 1866;—while they are openly affirmed in his *Idéal dans l'art*, 1869.—It is in this volume that, after having exhausted all the write "pieces with a purpose," and moralise to the top of their bent. Feuillet, indeed, is less successful as a dramatist than as a novelist, and I only mention him in this connection for the sake of completeness. But assuredly it is neither to "impassibility" nor even to "impartiality" that Émile Augier lays claim in the *Effrontés*, 1861, in the *Fils de Giboyer*, 1862, and still less in *Maître Guerin*, or in *Lions et Renards*, 1869; while Dumas, the bolder of the two, goes further still.

"We are lost,—he cries in the Preface he writes in 1868 to his *Fils naturel*—and dramatic art, that great art, is about to degenerate into a thing of tinsel, spangles and gewgaws; it will fall into the hands of the mountebanks

---

"natural" means of fixing the rank of works of art;—technical capacity;—permanence and depth of the character expressed by the works;—"convergence of effects";—he lays down as the decisive criterion,—"the degree in which their character makes for good."—And the criterion is open to discussion;—but it is a criterion, and one of a kind that no Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire would ever have invoked;—since it tends to rank the fox or the hyena much "below" the dog;—and the "æsthetic" consideration is reintroduced into criticism by its adoption.

In the meantime the events of 1870–1871, supervene;—they are a revelation to Taine. — He publishes his *Notes sur l'Angleterre*, 1872;—and conceives the plan of the great work—of which the first volume, *l'Ancien régime*, 1875,—is perhaps his masterpiece.—His study of the Revolution—acquaints him with a class of men he had hitherto had but a slight knowledge of.—He asks himself with an anxiety that does him credit,—if it be true "that a palace is beautiful even when it is burning *or especially when it is burning*";—and whether when we meet with a "crocodile" amongst our fellow men,—it is incumbent on us merely to describe and admire him?—His honesty causes him to reply in the negative;—with the result that unintentionally he reintroduces into criticism the "moral" consideration; — which assumes a preponderating importance in the closing volumes of his *Origines*, 1890–1892.—He thus finds himself back at the point in the circle from which he had started;—and he has employed forty years of uninterrupted labour;—to reinstate in eclecticism the principle he and become the gross amusement of the populace, if we do not hasten to press it into the service of the great social reforms and the great hopes of humanity." For his part, suiting his action to his word, he will henceforth make it his constant aim to contribute to what he designates by the somewhat strange expression, "the rise in value of humanity." Is it not a pity, under these circumstances, that the "Naturalist" he had been in his earlier years should too often clash with the moralist or moraliser he had pledged himself to become; that his always vivacious, but at once violent and commonplace style should betray to the very end the persons and places he had frequented in his youth; and that his virtuous women, and still

had most bitterly derided;—the principle, that is, of the subordination of criticism and history to morality.

In the interval he has displayed admirable gifts as a writer;—or even as a poet;—gifts that are only impaired by a certain artificiality. —The reader is too conscious "how" his finest pages were composed. —They are marred by too much rhetoric;—by too many obvious artifices;—especially in his later writings;—and by effects of a harshness and violence,—that are not solely ascribable to the nature of the subject.

3. The Works. — It is somewhat difficult to draw up a hard and fast classification of Taine's works. With the exception of the *Voyage aux Pyrénées*, 1835; of the *Vie et Opinions de Thomas Graindorge*, 1868; and of the *Notes sur l'Angleterre*, 1872, they are all of them "critical and historical" works.

Essai sur les fables de La Fontaine [written to obtain his Doctor's degree, 1853], revised under the title *La Fontaine et ses Fables*, 1860;—*Essai sur Tite Live*, 1855;—*Les Philosophes français*, 1856;—*Essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1858;—*Histoire de la littérature anglaise*, 1863, 4 vols. in 8vo, or 5 vols. in 12mo;—*Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1865;—*Philosophie de l'art en Italie*, 1865;—*De l'Idéal dans l'art*, 1867;—*Philosophie de l'art en Grèce*, 1869;—*Philosophie de l'art dans les Pays-Bas* [four volumes, afterwards (1881) published in two volumes under the title *Philosophie de l'art*];—*Voyage en Italie*, 1866;—*De l'Intelligence*, 1870;—the *Origines de la France contemporaine*, 1876–1890;—*Derniers essais de critique et d'histoire*, 1894;—*Carnets de Voyage*, 1896.

more his dialecticians,—both of whom come to conclusions that are less impeachable than the arguments they employ,—should seem to take an unconscious or paradoxal pleasure in celebrating the "hopes of humanity" in the somewhat unvarnished language of his Suzanne d'Ange or his Albertine de la Borde? "So much wit has never been made to serve the purpose of rendering us stupid," Voltaire formerly wrote to the author of the *Discours sur l'inégalité*: and similarly it will be said in the future that the cause of idealism has never been defended by methods more naturalistic than those of the author of *l'Étrangère* or of the *Princesse de Bagdad.* Impartial critics will add, however, that these methods were the

IX.—**Ernest Renan** [Tréguier, 1823; † 1892, Paris].

1. The Sources.—His Correspondence, only portions of which have appeared as yet: *Lettres à sa sœur Henriette*, 1896, Paris; and *Lettres à M. Berthelot*, Paris, 1898;—Ernest Renan, *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*, Paris, 1876–1882;—Abbé Cognat, *M. Renan hier et aujourd'hui*, 1883, Paris.

Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux lundis*, vol. ii., 1862; and vol. vi., 1863;—the works by Edmond Scherer, Abbé Guthlin, Caro, Janet, and Ravaisson, referred to above in the article on Taine;—Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, Paris, 1883;—Jules Lemaître, *Les contemporains*, vol. i., 1884.

A. Ledrain, *Renan, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1892;—James Darmesteter, *Notice sur la vie et l'œuvres de M. Renan*, Paris, 1893;—G. Séailles, *Renan*, Paris, 1895;—R. Allier, *La Philosophie d'Ernest Renan*, Paris, 1895;—Ch. Renouvier, *Philosophie analytique de l'histoire*, vol. ii., 1896, vol. iv., 1897.

2. The Man and the Writer.—His extraction;—his childhood;—and that while there was perhaps something in him of the "Gascon" and the "Breton,"—still his character, the nature of his intelligence and even his talent were more especially the work of his sister Henriette.—His early studies;—the seminary;—and was his estrangement from Christianity due to "philological" reasons?—It seems rather to have been due to reasons of a "philosophic" order;—of which it was not until later that he sought the justification in exegesis;—and

best or the most efficacious that Dumas could have employed at the time; and will remember, when reproaching him with their occasional vulgarity, that in the end they served the interests of art itself.

I would endeavour to prove this assertion, if I were in a position to do so; I mean if I had not been obliged to decide that I would offer no appreciation of any living author in this "Manual of the History of French Literature." There can be no history of contemporary matters; the thing is a contradiction in terms; we are too close to the men or the works of our time, and we lack the independence and the documents necessary to

much later still in natural history.—The *Avenir de la science*, 1849;—and that this work would be entirely representative of Renan,—if, at a later date, his popularity had not brought to the front,—the dilettante and the "trifler" in him,—whose existence had long been wholly unsuspected.

Renan's early works;—*Averroès et l'Averroïsme*, 1852;—*Histoire générale des langues sémitiques*, 1857;—*Études d'histoire religieuses*, 1848–1857;—*Essai sur l'origine du language*, 1858;—and that these works are not the least remarkable of those he has left.—Their common characteristic is that they display the desire, on the part of their author, to retain as much of "religion" as it is possible to retain in the absence of belief in religion;—an attitude which would simply be that of Voltaire;—were it not in a still greater measure that of Chateaubriand;—on account of the sincerity of sentiment Renan exhibits in this portion of his work;—and of the infinite charm of style with which he smoothes over the contradictory nature of his enterprise.—Another characteristic of these early works is their solid erudition [Cf. the *Livre de Job*, 1858; the *Cantique des Cantiques*, 1860; and in particular the *Discours sur l'état des beaux-arts au XIV^e siècle*].—Renan's contributions to the *Histoire littéraire de la France*.—How all these works helped to extend to a sensible degree the domain of literature,—by including in it, thanks to the power of style;—the results achieved by erudition, philosophy, and exegesis.

Publication of the *Vie de Jésus*;—emotion aroused by this book;

judge them. However, I may point out in general terms how considerable has been the influence of the ideas of Dumas; and to realise the fact it is sufficient to bear in mind how numerous are the influences over which the influence of Dumas seems to have triumphed at the moment at which I write.

It has triumphed over the *Dilettantism*, which certain belated disciples of Stendhal and Beaudelaire, impenitent self-admirers, Romanticists unbeknown to themselves, attempted to restore to favour on the morrow of the events of 1870–1871,—as if the sole effect of these events on literature had been to widen the breach between art and life. I do not allude here to the ill-advised imita-

and the reasons for this emotion, 1863.—The work was the first to give the results of Biblical criticism stripped of all the pedantry of German scholarship;—"sacred" history is brought down in it to the purely human level of all other history;—and for the Divine personage of the Gospels is substituted another personage;—real, and no longer symbolical or "mythical" as was the Jesus of Strauss and the German theologians.—These characteristics are again met with in all the volumes of the *Origines du christianisme*, 1863–1881;—but as the work approaches its conclusion;—Renan's criticism comes more and more to resemble that of Voltaire;—by reason of a certain disingenuousness in the interpretation of facts;—of a positive contempt for humanity, which must be deceived if it is to be influenced even for its good;—and of an affectation of levity totally out of place in connection with a subject of such gravity.—The work still displays some of the qualities of the author of the *Études d'histoire religieuse*;—his art of evoking an entire series of ideas by a single word;—the clearness of his style;—and an ease that will be at once appreciated by comparing it with the metallic brilliancy of Taine's prose.— Still in the later volumes dilettantism begins to make its appearance,— the most regrettable bent of mind there is for an historian;—so far as it leads him to regard his subject merely as a source of self-satisfaction;—and as a pretext for displaying his intellectual graces.

Renan's last works: *Caliban*, 1878;—*l'Eau de Jouvence*, 1880;—the Preface to the translation of the Book of Ecclesiastes, 1881;—the tions of Renan, of the Renan of the *Antechrist*, 1874, or of the *Abbesse de Jouarre*, 1886: these writers have overlooked the element of indestructible and uncompromising dogmatism that underlies the jesting of the master: *Saltavit et placuit*: he danced and he raised laughter! but there are two or three points that he never abandoned, and these two or three points constitute the whole of Positivism. I do not refer to the writers who, nurtured on the *Fleurs du mal*, and full of admiration for the portrait which Stendhal has drawn of himself in the character of Julian Sorel, only demanded of art that it should serve them as an instrument of solitary pleasure, and thus confounded it, not merely

Prêtre de Némi, 1885;—the *Abbesse de Jouarre*, 1886;—the *Histoire d'Israël*, 1887–1890.—Exaggeration of Renan's defects in these later writings;—and whether they are not the outcome in the main of a desire to show himself worthy of a popularity he had profoundly despised during his laborious early years?—They exhibit, however, that intellectual curiosity he retained to the very end;—the desire to understand his time;—and that religious veneration for science, that is all that remained to him in the shape of religion.—Taine was similarly situated;—but by a contradiction that finally characterises the two writers,—whereas Taine, whose starting-point had been pure "Naturalism," tended, almost from first to last, towards the reconstitution of the principles of the moral life;—Renan, whose starting-point had been a very lofty and very strict morality,—came, in his desire to make it broader, to disregard it,—and to adopt dilettantism as his rule of life.

His influence has been considerable;—as considerable as that of any of his contemporaries;—particularly during the last years of his life;—as being of a more general character,—and exerted in connection with more universal questions;—or with questions whose interest is more universally felt;—than that of the problems of pure æsthetics or art.—He also did much towards amusing his contemporaries.—Finally he was prodigal of "confessions";—at a period when his fellow-writers had ceased to indulge in "personal literature";—and he persuaded a generation of young men,—that forty years of labour and meditation had merely enabled him to arrive at conclusions at with its perversion,—*optimi corruptio pessima*—but with intellectual dissoluteness and debauchery. Nobody has protested more energetically than Dumas against this confusion, which is among the most deplorable that can be named, since it causes the name of art to serve as a screen to the most egoistic of trades; and nobody has denounced more energetically the dangers and the anti-social side of dilettantism.

He was no less energetic in his protests against Naturalism, more especially when this Naturalism, strangely degenerated from the idea that a Taine or a Flaubert had formed of it, became the exact opposite of what it had promised to be [Cf. F. Brunetière, *Le roman naturaliste*].

which, according to his own expression [Cf. *l'Ecclésiaste*], "a street arab arrives off hand."

3. The Works.—Renan's works may be divided into three principal groups, according as they appertain to pure erudition, to the general history of religions or of Christianity in particular, or to what we should term philosophy, were it not necessary to distinguish in this last group between the really serious works and those which are purely fanciful.

(1) *Works of pure erudition: Averroès et l'Averroïsme* [written in view of his degree], 1852;—*Histoire générale et comparée des langues sémitiques*, 1857;—*Essai sur l'origine du langage*, 1858;—his Papers in the *Journal asiatique* or the *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions*;—and his articles in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vols. xxiv. to xxx.

To the above should be added the important work entitled *Mission de Phénicie*, 1865;—and his contributions to the *Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*.

(2) *Religious history.—Études d'histoire religieuse*, 1857;—and *Nouvelles études d'histoire religieuse*, 1884; two volumes, the second of which contains some of Renan's early writings on Buddhism and on St. Francis of Assisi.—*De la part des peuples sémitiques dans l'histoire de la civilisation*, brochure, 1861;—*Vie de Jésus*, 1863; *les Apôtres*, 1866; *Saint Paul*, 1869; *l'Antechrist*, 1873; *les Évangiles*, 1877; *l'Église chrétienne*, 1879; *Marc-Aurèle*, 1881, seven volumes, completed by an index;—*Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, 1887–1892.

It is true that in this instance other influences, whose action still continues, singularly aided or amplified that of Dumas. Foremost among the influences in question is that of Schopenhauer, whose idealist Pessimism, differed so widely and so happily from that vulgar Pessimism which is a mere disguise for unsatisfied appetites and the pride of life. Another of these influences is that of George Eliot, of whose Naturalism it may be said that it is an ethical or a sociological rather than an æsthetic principle; a circumstance that distinguishes it from the purely artistic or impassible Naturalism of the author of *l'Éducation sentimentale* or *Madame Bovary*. There is further the influence of Tolstoi and of Ibsen, of the

To the above should be added translations: of the Book of Job, 1858; of the Song of Solomon, 1860; of Ecclesiastes, 1881;—and the volume entitled *Conférences d'Angleterre*, 1881.

(3) *Philosophic works.—Essais de morale et de critique*, 1860;—*Questions contemporaines*, 1868;—*La réforme intellectuelle et morale*, 1871;—*Dialogues et fragments philosophiques*, 1876;—*Mélanges d'histoire et de voyages*, 1878;—*Discours et conférences*, 1887;—*l'Avenir de la science*, 1890 [written in 1848].

The following works form a group apart: *Caliban*, 1878;—*l'Eau de Jouvence*, 1880;—*le Prêtre de Némi*, 1885;—*1802: Dialogue des morts*, 1886;—and *l'Abbesse de Jouarre*, 1886.

The *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse*, 1876–1882, together with such of the Correspondence as has appeared, form a final category.

X.—**Charles Baudelaire** [Paris, 1821; † 1867, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, vol. ix., 1859;—Théophile Gautier, *Notice sur Charles Baudelaire* and *Rapport sur les progrès de la poésie*, 1868;—Ch. Asselineau, *Baudelaire, sa vie et son œuvre*, Paris, 1869;—*Charles Baudelaire, souvenirs, correspondance, bibliographie* [by Charles Cousin and Spœlberch de Lovenjoul], Paris, 1872;—Maxime du Camp, *Souvenirs littéraires*, Paris, 1882;—Charles Baudelaire's posthumous works and unpublished correspondence, edited by M. Eugène Crépet, Paris, 1887;—Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 1883;—F. Brunetière, *Histoire*

Russian novel and the Norwegian drama, productions the exact nature of which cannot be determined, as they are too close to us, though it is clear that their principal source of inspiration is "social pity." It has been feared by some that the French genius would lose certain of its qualities, and even the consciousness of its power under the action, the apparently conflicting action, of so many influences; they have attacked these influences in consequence, but how? Simply by declaring that, before Tolstoi or George Eliot, French writers, notably George Sand, but more especially and more recently Alexander Dumas, had given expression to what it had been imagined was most Russian in Tolstoi and most "Anglo-Saxon" in George Eliot.

et littérature, vol. iii., 1887, and *Nouveaux Essais*, 1891;—Maurice Spronck, *les Artistes littéraires*, 1889.

2. THE RÔLE OF BAUDELAIRE;—and that it is entirely posthumous. —Even the *Fleurs du mal* would have attracted scarcely any attention, —had it not been for the dubious popularity they acquired, owing to the judicial proceedings of which they were the object.—But his death in 1867 having recalled attention to him,—and removed the scruples many persons would have felt in professing themselves his admirers or disciples during his lifetime,—it is from this date that he exerted,—and that he still exerts a real, and in the main a threefold, influence.—He realised that morbid poetry,—which had been the dream of Sainte-Beuve's earlier years,—and the principle of which is pride in suffering from some unusual or anomalous disease.—In this way he discovered and gave expression to certain phenomena,—whose morbid character is to some extent atoned for by the keenness of the sensations they procure,—and also by the very brutality of the words to which recourse must be had to express them.—Finally, by his efforts to express these phenomena,—he inaugurated contemporary symbolism,—if this symbolism consists essentially in a confused mixture of mysticism and sensuality.—The question, however, arises in connection with these "innovations"—as to how far their author was sincere;—and whether an entire school of writers has not been the dupe of a dangerous mystifier.

3. THE WORKS.—In addition to his translations of Edgar Poe, *His-*

It is in this way that the influence of Dumas has also triumphed over the doctrine of art for art,—which, moreover, he did not understand when he reproached it with inculcating "the mere reproduction of facts," while he understood it still less when with his peremptory assurance he declared it "absolutely devoid of sense." The author of the *Poèmes Antiques* and the *Poèmes Barbares* was aware of what he was about! Indeed, he had a clearer view of his goal than Dumas, who wrote the *Visite de noces*, while he talked of utilising the stage as a moralising force. Still Dumas was right in recalling that man is not made for art, but, on the contrary, art for man: a point which nobody contests to-day. If the

toires extraordinaires, 1856;—*Nouvelles histoires extraordinaires*, 1857;—*Histoires grotesques et sérieuses*, 1865;—and to his *Fleurs du mal*, 1857, there seems to be nothing worth mention unless it be his *Paradis artificiels*;—and the very searching articles on various French poets he contributed to Crépet's *Recueil des poètes français*.

There is an edition in seven volumes of his complete works, Paris, 1868–1870, Michel Lévy.

XI.—The Influence of German Literature.

The German influence, after its introduction by Mme de Staël, continued to make itself felt,—but down to 1860 its effects were chiefly seen in the writings of certain members of the University, notably in those of Saint-René Taillandier.—But from 1860 onwards its importance increases,—and it makes itself felt simultaneously in three or four directions.

1. In philosophy;—through the medium of Ernest Renan;—Edmond Scherer [Cf. his study of Hegel in his *Mélanges d'histoire religieuse*, 1861];—and Étienne Vacherot [Cf. *la Métaphysique et la science*];—Hegelianism comes into vogue,—and there is endless talk of "the identity of the contradictory" [Cf. Gratry, *les Sophistes et la Critique*];—a formula in wonderful accordance with the budding idea of evolution.—It is towards the same period that the *Revue germanique* is founded;—and that Schopenhauer is discovered or rediscovered [Cf. Foucher de Careil, *Hegel et Schopenhauer*, 1862, Paris, and Challemel-Lacour, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, 1870],

painter or the sculptor be justified in concerning themselves solely with the realisation of character or beauty, the case is not the same with the dramatist or the poet, because they have recourse to words, and words express ideas and ideas serve as causes or motives of action. Dumas had an insight into this truth, though he expressed it somewhat confusedly: "All literature the aim of which is not perfectibility, moralisation, the ideal, in a word the useful, is a weakly, unwholesome, and stillborn literature." It may be regretted that he did not express himself better, but at least he raised his voice, and though to begin with he met with violent contradictors, it was his view, and not that of the Leconte

—whose doctrines, better understood, will later on, towards 1875, renew the philosophic conception of love, and in consequence that of life itself.

2. In erudition;—and more particularly in exegesis and philology; —Strauss and Baur;—Bopp and Diez;—Mommsen and Curtius being taken as masters.

3. In art and literature;—almost the whole of Schiller and Goethe is translated at this period;—the claims of Heinrich Heine are enforced against the most illustrious of the Romanticists;—and "Wagnerianism" begins to gain ground both for musical reasons;—and in consequence of the artistic doctrines that are deduced from it [Cf. Ed. Schuré, *le Drame musical*, Paris, 1875].—Henceforth, in spite of some "patriotic" opposition,—no influence is destined to exert a more considerable action,—for the reason that it is not exclusively "musical";—but philosophic;—and yet more because it has provided up to the present,—one of the principal elements of resistance to be found in the entire domain of European thought;—to the invasion of naturalism,—and of a naturalism even more superficial than coarse.

XII.—**Alexandre Dumas fils** [Paris, 1824; † 1895, Paris].

1. THE SOURCES.—The dramatic criticisms of Jules Janin in the *Journal des Débats*;—of Théophile Gautier in the *Presse* and the *Moniteur*;—of F. Sarcey in the *Opinion nationale* and the *Temps*;—of Jules Lemaître in the *Journal des Débats*;—Weiss, *Essais sur*

de Lisles or the Flauberts, that was accepted in the end.

The foregoing observations may be summed up by saying that, after having been *individualist* in the hands of the Romanticists, and *impersonal* in those of the Naturalists, modern French literature, considered as a whole, has again become *social.* And if, in the guise of a conclusion, we express the wish that it may continue to deserve this epithet, it is in nowise because we ascribe to it some secret meaning or mystic value! Nor is it because we take our own personal opinion as the arbitrary standard of the opinion of others. It

---

l'histoire de la littérature française, 1857–1858;—Léopold Lacour, *Trois théâtres*, Paris, 1880;—Émile Zola, *Nos auteurs dramatiques*; and *Documents littéraires*, Paris, 1881;—Paul Bourget, *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 1886;—Paul de Saint-Victor, *le Théâtre contemporain*, Paris, 1889;—René Doumic, *Portraits d'écrivains*, 1892; and *Essais sur le théâtre contemporain*, 1895–1897;—H. Parigot, *le Théâtre d'hier*, Paris, 1893; and *Génie et Métier*, Paris, 1894.

2. THE MAN AND THE WRITER;—and that to understand Dumas fils from either point of view,—and still more to judge him,—it must be kept in view that he affected all his life to be in revolt;—an attitude, however, whose independence was limited—by that need of pleasing,—and of humouring opinion in order to please—which is always the stumbling-block of the dramatist.

A. *The Realist;*—and that to start with he was merely a descendant of the Romanticists,—and a weak imitator of his father,—in the *Aventures de trois femmes et d'un perroquet*, 1846–1847;—in *le docteur Servand*, 1849;—and in *le Régent Mustel*, 1852 [Cf. J. J. Weiss, *loc. cit., Les Romans de M. Dumas fils*].—These works are equally wanting in imagination, style, and anything in the shape of artistic intention;—and if anything is more striking than the prodigious ignorance of their author;—it is his self-sufficiency;—two legacies of his "big child" and "good fellow of a father" [Cf. *Un père prodigue*].—The success of the *Dame aux camélias*, 1848 (the novel) and 1852 (the play),—shows him the true nature of his talent;—which lay in the imitation of what he had observed himself;—doubt-is that we have substantial reasons for adopting the view in question—the very reasons we have endeavoured to make clear in this summary of the history of French literature. For while *dilettantism* has certainly had the happy consequence that by developing or exciting intellectual curiosity it has sharpened its insight or widened its scope, and while further it cannot be denied,—and we have been careful not to deny,—that *Naturalism* has rendered us useful and even precious services on at least two or three occasions in the course of our history, at the same time there is nothing to prevent a "social" literature from appropriating the conquests of *naturalism*

less an inferior form of realism;—as is that of a Champfleury or a Courbet;—whose realism is solely due to the sterility of their invention;—but is nevertheless a form of realism.—Difference in this respect between the realism of Dumas and that of Flaubert or Taine. —*Diane de Lys* constitutes a sort of return to Romanticism;—but from the *Demi-Monde* onwards (1855),—Dumas confines himself to realism and the imitation of contemporary manners.—The *Question d'argent*, 1857;—the *Fils naturel*, 1858, which is a portrait of Dumas himself;—the *Père prodigue*, 1859, which is the portrait of his father; —*l'Ami des femmes*, 1864;—and *l'Affaire Clémenceau*, 1866,—are all of them works in which the realistic characteristics dominate;—as regards the nature of the plots;—the choice of the personages;—and the familiarity of the style.—There appears a further difference between Dumas' "realism" and that of Flaubert or Leconte de Lisle; —namely, his almost absolute indifference to form;—and his belief that an author writes sufficiently well if he succeeds in obtaining a hearing.—Another difference is his tendency to discuss "problems" and to moralise.

B. *The Dramatist.*—It is under the influence of this tendency;—a tendency encouraged by the direct personal influence of George Sand;—by the less direct but not less unquestionable influence of Michelet;—and by the desire to rival the in some sort political successes of Augier [Cf. *Les effrontés* and the *Fils de Giboyer*],—that Dumas invents a new type of drama,—of which the *Idées de madame Aubray*, 1867,—are the first example.—For while Augier continues to undergo the influence of Scribe;—and moreover would be at a loss to and *dilettantism.* On the contrary, the conquests achieved by a social literature cannot be taken over by dilettantism or naturalism, since the former is synonymous with individualism, and the latter consists in the absolute submission of the writer to his subject; or more exactly, in his acceptation of his subject. In his eyes phenomena are what they ought to be, and when he has attained to a comprehension of them, he esteems them not merely legitimate, but "natural," and in consequence necessary. In the second place, a "social" literature has the advantage—in the land of George Sand and Lamennais, of Voltaire and Montesquieu, of Bossuet and Racine, of

throw it off;—Dumas frees himself from it;—and each of his plays becomes a "thesis,"—of which the personages are merely the spokesmen;—and the plot the demonstration.—In general the object of the thesis is to demonstrate the iniquity of the Code [Cf. F. Moreau, *Le code civil et le Théâtre contemporain*];—the causes pleaded more especially being the right to prove affiliation, the right of divorce, and the identical responsibility of the man and the woman in cases of seduction or adultery.—The Prefaces to the complete edition of the Plays [that of 1866–1870];—and that it must not be overlooked that they are posterior by ten years to the plays they precede,—and that they correspond to the new conception of his art adopted by the author of the *Idées de madame Aubray.*

It was in conformity with these new principles,—strengthened in him by the spectacle of the events of 1870–1871 [Cf. *Lettres de Junius*, 1870–1871],—that Alexandre Dumas wrote *La Visite de noces*, 1871;—*la Princesse Georges*, 1871;—*la Femme de Claude*, 1873;—three plays in at least two of which it does not appear that the "thesis" is detrimental to the dramatic value of the work;—but, on the contrary, the obligation of "demonstrating" has rid the drama of several embarrassing conventions.—They reintroduced into the drama a simplicity of action Scribe had banished from it;—since he trusted solely for success to the unexpectedness of his combinations.—They further introduced a passionate element,—that would be sought for in vain in Augier's comedies or dramas,—in which it is never clear *why* the personages act in this way or that rather than in some other way.—And finally, they restored to the drama,—the

Montaigne and even of Rabelais,—of being in conformity with the traditions four or five centuries old of the French genius. *Omnia quæ loquitur populus iste conjuratio est!* Whatever does not express in the language of the generality truths that interest or concern the generality, as well as whatever is not clear, is not French; and it will be remarked that it is for this reason that the majority of our Romanticists, and still more of our Dilettantes are ignored by foreigners. England or Germany have better writers of this class among their native authors! On the other hand, the socialisation of literature, if I may venture on this expressive barbarism,

literary, psychological and moral importance,—it had been almost wholly lacking in for a century past;—for what is the significance of the *Aventurière*, or the *Verre d'eau*, or of the *Tour de Nesle*, or even of *Marion Delorme*?

C. *The Moralist.*—Of the transformation of the "realist" into the "moralist,"—of the Dumas of *Diane de Lys* or of the *Dame aux Camélias*,—into the Dumas of *l'Étrangère*, 1876;—of *la Princesse de Bagdad*, 1881;—of *Denise*, 1885;—and of *Francillon*, 1887.—That it must be confessed that it is a pity that Dumas, the moralist, is sometimes wanting in good sense;—more often still in an adequate knowledge of the questions he deals with;—and always in moderation.—The deficiencies of Dumas' early education are only too perceptible;—even in his manner of stating the problems he treats [Cf. *les Femmes qui tuent* and *les Femmes qui votent*] 1880,—or again *la Question du divorce*, 1880.—After adapting them to the requirements of the stage, he solves too off-handedly difficulties;—of which he is blind to the complexity.—He nevertheless did considerable good—if only in passing frankly and resolutely from "naturalism" to "idealism"; without effort and solely in consequence of the progress of his reflections.—He was one of the first among his contemporaries,—following an attitude he adopted in writing the *Idées de Madame Aubray* and maintained down to *Francillon*,—to reunite art and life,—which it had been attempted to separate.—Doubtless it is to be regretted that of all his plays,—those which are sure to survive the longest are his "realistic" dramas,—but this accidental contingency is no objection against his talent as a dramatist;—or against "pieces with a purhas allowed us in the past, not only, as has been seen, to resist foreign influence, and to assimilate merely such foreign elements as could be made to serve the turn of our genius, but to exercise in the world the intellectual supremacy we have wielded more often than any other people. Finally, if it be essentially characteristic of a "social" literature that it tends, as has been said, towards "the perfecting of civil life," or, as we should say to-day, towards the progress of civilisation, what more could we add? For four hundred years our literature and even our language have enabled us to promote both the greatness of France and the common

---

pose";—or against the generousness of his effort,—and still less against the idea—more generally accepted than ever at present—that art has "a social function."

3. THE WORKS.—Omitting his early novels, which are now almost unreadable, his works comprise:

(1) The *Dame aux camélias* (novel), 1848;—and the *Affaire Clémenceau*, 1886;

(2) His Plays, the last edition of which in 7 volumes, Paris, 1890–1893, Calmann Lévy includes: *la Dame aux camélias*, 1852; *Diane de Lys*, 1853; *le Bijou de la reine*, 1855 (in verse);—the *Demi-Monde*, 1855; *la Question d'argent*, 1857; *le Fils naturel*, 1858: *Un Père prodigue*, 1859;—*l'Ami des femmes*, 1864; *les Idées de Madame Aubray*, 1867;—*Une visite de noces*, 1871; *la Princesse Georges*, 1871; *la Femme de Claude*, 1873;—*Monsieur Alphonse*, 1873; *l'Étrangère*, 1876;—*la Princesse de Bagdad*, 1881; *Denise*, 1885; *Francillon*, 1887. To the above are to be added two volumes entitled: *le Théâtre des autres*, in which he is responsible to at least as great an extent as Augier for *les Lionnes pauvres* or as Barrière for *les Faux bonshommes*. The other pieces are *le Supplice d'une femme* [in collaboration with Emile de Girardin], 1865; *Héloïse Paranquet* [in collaboration with Armand Durantin], 1866;—*le Filleul de Pompignac*, 1869; *la Comtesse Romani* [in collaboration with M. Fould], 1877;—and *les Danicheff* [in collaboration with M. Pierre Corvin], 1879.

He also "recast" some of George Sand's pieces, the best known being the *Marquis de Villemer*, 1864.

good of humanity. Who would not sacrifice to this generous ideal something of his "individualism" and the strange vanity of being alone in admiring and understanding himself?

(3) In addition to his novels and plays Dumas is the author:—of three volumes entitled *Entr'actes*, 1878–1879, and one volume entitled *Nouveaux Entr'actes*, 1890, in which the majority of his brochures and fugitive writings have been reprinted under his own supervision;—of *la Question du divorce*, 1880;—and of *Une lettre à M. Rivet, député, sur la recherche de la paternité*, 1883.

THE END.

The Gresham Press

UNWIN BROTHERS

WOKING AND LONDON

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 084203139